

# LIVERPOOL CLASSICAL MONTHLY

ISSN 0309-3700

Vol. 13 No 9 November 1988

No.10 December 1988

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool  
by Dr J.Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA  
Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,  
P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,  
RATES for 1988, 10 issues (not August and September)  
SURFACE £8.50 UK, £9.50 Europe, \$(US)17.50 elsewhere  
AIR £10 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.



CONTENTS, of which the authors retain the copyright.  
The Editor retains copyright in the format.

<b>H. D. Jocelyn</b> (Manchester): <i>Silius and Republican Latin Literature</i>	131-133
<b>G.B.A.Fletcher</b> (Gosforth, Newcastle upon Tyne): <i>On passages in Lucan</i>	133-136
<b>R.Brock</b> (St Andrews): <i>The courts in 411</i>	136-138
<b>J.A.S.Evans</b> (UBC Vancouver): <i>The story of Pythius</i>	139
<b>T.J.Leary</b> (Worcester College, Oxford): <i>Medicamina recalled</i>	140-142
<b>P.G.Naiditch</b> (Dept. of Special Collections, Research Library, UCLA): <i>Housman's knowledge of Greek</i>	142-144
<b>Robin Osborne</b> (Magdalen College, Oxford): <i>On being a straw man</i>	144-145
<b>David Whitehead</b> (Manchester): <i>Athenians in Xenophon's Hellenica</i>	145-147
<b>Niall W.Slater</b> (Center for Hellenic Studies) <i>The Date of Euripides' Oineus</i>	147-148
Review: <b>Brian Arkins</b> (Galway)	148-151
John Ferguson, <i>Catullus, Greece &amp; Rome. New Surveys in the Classics No.20</i> , published for the Classical Association, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988. Pp.viii + 50, paper, £2.50. ISSN 0017-3835.	
Review: <b>W.Geoffrey Arnott</b> (Leeds)	151-155
G.O.Hutchinson, <i>Hellenistic Poetry</i> , Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988. Pp.xii + 374. Cloth, £40. ISBN 0-19-81 4040-1	
Review: <b>Philip Harding</b> (UBC Vancouver)	155-156
K.Adshead, <i>Politics of the Archaic Peloponnese: The transition from Archaic to Classical politics</i> , Avebury 1986, pp.142, price not stated. ISBN 0-86127-024-X	
Review: <b>Christopher Mee</b> (Liverpool)	156-157
R.N.L.Barber, <i>The Cyclades in the Bronze Age</i> , London, Duckworth, 1987. Pp.xviii + 283. Cloth, £28. ISBN 0-7156-2160-2.	
Review: <b>Robin Seager</b> (Liverpool)	157-159
K. J.Hölkeskamp, <i>Der Entstehung der Nobilität</i> , Stuttgart, Steiner, 1987. Pp.303, paper.g2 ISBN 3515046216	
<b>Correspondence</b> from Mr J.Taylor, Prof.W.G.Arnott, Prof.William M.Calder III	159-160

*LCM* has before now issued an additional number (7.2 in August 1987) and more recently has distributed two months together. But this is the first double-number, 9 & 10, November & December, with, perhaps to the relief of some readers, only one set of Editor's notes. Its second part is devoted to clearing the backlog of reviews, it always having been the policy of *LCM* to print them, if possible, in the issue immediately following receipt. Publishers seem to like *LCM's* reviews and the Editor receives more books than he is always able to find reviewers. His contribution to the January issue of 1989 (if spared) will take the form of the second 'Editor's book notes' and he will invite bids for review of any book mentioned therein. That issue will also contain the invoices, for which subscribers are asked to wait before remitting.

It would indeed be financially more profitable to *LCM* (though less so for the Post Office) were it to become a bi-monthly (bimensual [?]) or on the analogy of quarterly a fifthly, though the Editor notes that the prestigious *Classical Quarterly* is now effectively a biennial, but the present issue does not represent a change of policy, and for many reasons *LCM* will continue to appear monthly, and its New Year resolution is of course to be able to fulfil the original claim that it appears 'on or about the first of the month' (to which perhaps, in the light of past experience, should be added the words 'of which it bears the name').

One of those reasons is not the difficulty that would be caused by the fact that *LCM* does not publish in August and September, which reflects the old Long Vacation, now increasingly under pressure, so that a single number would have to cover July and October. It is rather that the frequent appearance of a short journal is, the Editor believes, one of the factors that means that *LCM* is read (and sometimes replied to) as it appears, and not saved up for study or neglect at leisure. A more important factor is, of course, the contributors, the majority of whom adopt the particular style that is characteristic of the journal (which used to eschew footnotes, though the new technology and the charity of the Editor now permits him to publish articles that contain them and only to incorporate them in the text, or to make other editorial changes, if he knows the author very well). This style reflects the fact that *LCM* is what the publication lists by members of staff of some universities outlaw, an un-refereed journal, appearance in which may not benefit the authors (though the Editor hopes that mere appearance in his pages will not damn them). For contributors know that they are dealing with an onymous Editor and not anonymous 'readers', and therefore that they may fulfil the original aims of *LCM* by floating ideas 'even without the full apparatus of scholarship'. It is for this reason that the Editor firmly resists the suggestions that are from time to time made that he should regularize *LCM* by some more legitimate association with the Department, Faculty or University, or with another publisher: for that would inevitably mean an Editorial Committee, and the loss of that independence which he believes has been one of the reasons for the continuing (even surprising) survival (to say success would be to tempt fate) of *LCM*. The Editor continues to be grateful for the tolerance and support he is afforded by the triad he mentioned above, and he hopes that it will continue to be afforded when the time comes for him to retire, well aware though he is of the difficulties created for both sides by his continuing existence in a kind of academic twilight, though he hopes that they are as aware of its contribution to their reputation as he is of the advantages he gains from this quango-like position. Or the time may come when the Editor might be forced to call upon such good will as he has built up among contributors and subscribers, and ask them to make forcible representations on his behalf to the authorities.

Such a casting of the balance and reminder of the principles upon which *LCM* operates are timely at the year end, and timeliness, opportunity, is the theme of this year's greetings card, the colophon employed by the Lyons printer Temporal (1550-1559), embodying the hope that in 1989 all readers as well as the management of the journal may be able to take time by the forelock even if the sands appear at times to be running out for young as well as for old. Themes at the CUCD conference this year are 'Classics in the marketplace' and 'Classics and Westminster: a political forum' and even the third theme, 'Classical research [surely to be pronounced with the stress on the first syllable]: future perspectives' continues 'Funding, sources of publication [such as *LCP?*], group projects'. The Editor, in his dinosaurian way, has always liked what he believed to be an Oxford maxim, that you should not give a person any money for research until that person has shown willingness to contribute his own, in which case you don't need to. But he will be told, not for the first time, that it is all right for him, he is not going to have to live with the new system, one in which, as in the Principate, the rules for success have been changed and the future lies with those whose names end in *idius*, *-edius* and *-ienus* and not with the old aristocracy.

Macneice's *Eclogue for Christmas* (death and eminence have earned the author the right to drop the forename) begins with the couplet:

A. I meet you in an evil time:

B. The evil bells

put out of our heads, I think, the thought of anything else:

and the Editor sees signs in NAAS (the New Academic Appointments Scheme) that there will soon be renewed pressure for early retirement by even the over-50s (and he heard some time ago of one University that circulated newly appointed staff with details of the scheme then in existence), something which could have the effect of permitting a future historian of the Universities to exclaim with Tacitus *quotus quisque relictus qui rem publicam vidisset?*

The traditional journalistic colophon to a Christmas Editorial must not, however, be omitted from these Editor's Notes, however incongruous it may seem both stylistically and in content from the paragraphs which precede it.



### A Happy Christmas to all our Readers

H. D. Jocelyn (Manchester): *Silius and Republican Latin Literature*

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 131-133

The rich collection of parallel passages published by G. B. A. Fletcher as *Siliana* in LCM 13.7 (1988), 101-105, tacitly challenges the loquacity of Alan Ker's homonymous paper in PCPhS ns.13 (1967), 14-31. Professor Fletcher aims at no more than correcting and supplementing the published commentaries on and translations of the *Punica* and the monographs and articles devoted to particular passages of the poem. François Spaltenstein's recent commentary on books 1-8 (Geneva 1986) might have seemed to make up in fullness what it lacks in acuity. A quick comparison shows, however, that it anticipated Fletcher's collection in only 10 of 63 places. Thus far does fishing in lexicia fall short of reading the actual texts.

Silius' veneration of Virgil is remarked by Martial (11.48 and 50) and Pliny (Ep. 3.7.8). His extensive exploitation of the vocabulary and phraseology of the *Aeneid* has long been a common-place of criticism. It is consequently a surprise that Fletcher should have been able to put his finger on so many new parallels. Until one thinks of the idleness of those who like to talk these days about post-Augustan poetry. The Ciceronian parallel with 12.50 (*Prou.14* [already noted in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, VI i, fasc.1 (1913), 218.36-7]) fits with what Martial says at 7. 63 but may be without significance; not much post-Ciceronian oratory survives. Many scholars have felt that a poem treating the same theme as books 7-9 of Ennius' *Annales* and referring to Ennius himself in such terms as at 12.387-419 could hardly not have shown traces of a careful reading of the great Republican epic (cf. E. Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* [Leipzig-Berlin 1915], 49 n.2, 119 n.1, M. Bettini, *RFIC* 105 [1977], 425 n.2 = *Note enniane* [Pisa 1979], 143 n.2, O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* [Oxford 1985], 17-18). On the other hand they have succeeded in turning up very few, if any, entirely convincing close verbal parallels. Fletcher offers no new ones. He does, however, cite Republican tragedy thrice (I include in this category the relevant phrase in the verses of the fragment of one of Varro's *Epistulae* ap. Non. p.263.4-5) and the *De rerum natura* of Lucretius the same number of times. The scantiness of the harvest is as significant in its way as is A. Klotz's total silence about tragedy and the *De rerum natura* at *RE* II 3.1 (1927), 82-4. Silius lived and worked at a time when the prestige of the pre-Augustan writers had sunk very low. He made no marked departure from the fashions in favour about him.

A little may be said about the general significance of each of the early items in Fletcher's collection. The more systematically assembled material of the *ThLL* and the special concordances provides the indispensable context.



1. 484-5 Ker referred to the *ThLL* article on *inquirō* (VII i, fasc. 12 [1958], 1815-19) when he declared, art.cit.15, "*inquirō* always elsewhere seems to mean 'to look into' or 'investigate', until we come to the Christian writers". But, clearly, he had not read the article. Its author cited in fact a number of pre-Silian examples of the verb used in the sense of 'seek out, look for', starting with Pacuvius, *Trag.* 219-20. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, fasc.4 (1973), 919, was also to pick up a number of these, for once making real progress over the lexica of Forcellini and Lewis and Short, although wrongly adding Manilius 4. 908. Fletcher hardly needed, therefore, to throw his learning at Ker's conjecture *require*.

The material presented in the *ThLL* shows something of the colour of the usage in question. Lawyers affected it (first in Gaius, in *Dig.* 41.3.1, but Livy 31.19.2, Seneca, *Contr.* 10.1.2 et al. suggest that it goes back some way), while Cicero, Caesar and careful prose-stylists avoided it. Interestingly, Jerome attempted to replace it in the Latin Bible with that of *requiro*. The tragedians (Seneca as well as Pacuvius) and the historians (Justin [3.4.10] and Ammianus [16.12.53] as well as Livy) used it to dignify their style. The epic poets on the other hand, for no reason that I can discern, avoided it. Silius would have taken it over from one of his historical sources (cf. below on 16.496).

2. 21 The *ThLL*, III, fasc.1 (1907), 147.53-5, puts this passage together with Lucretius 3.642-3 *currus . . . permixta caede calentis* and 5.1313 (*leones*) *permixta caede calentes*. We could have here one of those Lucretian repetitions which originated in Ennius' *Annales* (cf. 1.22, 1. 170, 1.179, 2.617 in *luminis oras* = *Ann.* 135). The idea of the hotness of freshly spilt blood (cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 95), exaggerated to that of its ability to heat what it touches, and the use of *caedes* in the sense of *sanguis* (first at Catullus 64.181, but quite possibly Ennian) mark the phrase as distinctly as does the alliteration. We could not, however, deduce with certainty that Silius got it direct either from Lucretius or from Ennius. Epic poets continued to talk of the hotness of blood through the first century A. D. (cf. Silius 7.66, 10.145) and to employ *caedes* as a metrically convenient synonym of *sanguis* (cf. Silius 1.419 et al.). Martial 14.4.1 *caede iuuenorum domini calet area felix* suggests that by the second half of the century the combination *caede calere* had become a commonplace of the poetic language.

7. 322 The *ThLL*, III, fasc. 4 (1909), 946.54-5, produces no exact parallel except Lucretius 1.33-5 in *gremium . . . tuum se reicit . . . atque ita suspiciens tereti ceruice reposta*. To be contrasted is Ovid, *Met.* 10.558 in *que sinu iuuenis posita ceruice reclinis*. The use of the singular *ceruix* (cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 483) and the syncopated participle *repostus* (cf. Ennius ap. Serv. *Virg. Aen.* 1.26) set Lucretius' phraseology apart even in the first century B.C. We cannot, however, be certain that here lay Silius' immediate source. Singular *ceruix* remained a constant part of the poetic language through the next century (Silius has *ceruice* 16 times against *ceruicibus* 3). *Repostus* was avoided by some writers of epic (e.g. by Manilius, Ovid and Lucan) and admitted sparingly by others (by Virgil 6 times, Valerius Flaccus 2, Statius 3); Silius himself has it 11 times. A second occurrence of the combination *ceruice reposta* in the record could be the result of pure chance.

12. 438-9 The transmitted text is *angustis e faucibus aequor erumpit scopulos inter* (accepted without query by J. Delz in his edition of 1987). Nicolaus Heinsius in the notes printed by Drakenborch in 1717 suggested *angustis se faucibus erumpit scopulos inter*, citing for *erumpere se* Accius, *Trag.* 287, Varro, *Men.* 271, Caesar, *Ciu.* 2.14.1, Caelius ap. Cicero, *Fam.* 8.14.2, Lucretius 4.1115, Virgil, *Georg.* 4.368 (only Scribonius Largus 46 can be added) and mentioning other instances in archaic and classical Latin of the use of the redundant reflexive with a normally intransitive verb of movement (*irrupere se* [Varro, *Men.* 411], *irruere se* [Terence, *Ad.* 550], *emergere se* [Terence, *Andr.* 562 et al.]). F.H. Bothe (1855-7) altered the paradox further to *angustis e faucibus irrupit scopulos inter*, doubtlessly exploiting Heinsius' citation of Varro, *Men.* 411. The *ThLL*, VII 2, fasc.3 (1962), 444-8, s.v. *irrumpe*, ignores the reflexive use. It is therefore worth having Fletcher's reminder. We cannot, however, entertain either Heinsius' conjecture or Bothe's. Silius has 23 clear cases of intransitive *erumpere* and 11 of intransitive *irrupere*. Epic poetry and other literary genres

of the first century A. D. shunned the redundant reflexive pronoun even although the spoken language probably continued to tolerate it.

13. 153 The *ThLL*, II, fasc 5 (1903), 1144.80-81, puts Varro, frg. Non. 263 *mi attigit auris nuntius* on one side of Silius' *uox attigit aures* and Claudian 26. 412 *sonus attigit aurem* on the other. It would be worth pointing out that Nonius quotes from one of Varro's *Epistulae* two trochaic septenarii:

*quem simul ac Romam uenisse mi adtigit aures nuntius  
extemplo †eas† in curriculum contuli propere pedes.*

These appear to be related in some way to the opening words of Cicero's letter to Atticus, 13. 47:

*posteaquam abs te Agamemno non ut uenirem (nam id  
quoque fecissem nisi Torquatus esset) ut scriberem tetigit  
aures nuntius, extemplo instituto omisi.*

A passage of tragedy probably lies behind the two passages. Plautus, *Poen.* 1375-6 *quod uerbum auris meas | tetigit* has a paratragic context. Likewise Plautus, *Rud.* 233 *certo uox muliebris auris tetigit meas*. It would, be wrong, however, to detect in Silius any direct acquaintance with a Republican tragic script. To judge by Ovid, *Pont.* 4.9.125 *haec tangent aliquando Caesaris aures*, Germanicus 37 *uagitus pueri patrias ne tangeret auris*, Juvenal 10.340-41 *dum res | nota urbi et populo contingat principis aurem*, the locution was a commonplace of the general poetic language of the first century A. D.

16. 68 The *ThLL*, VIII, fasc. 11 (1966), 1688. 72-7, lists in front of Silius' *qui postquam murus miseris ruit* Trag. inc.69 *ferron an fato murus Argiuom occidit?*, Ovid, *Met.* 13. 281 *Graium murus Achilles*, Seneca, *Suas.* 2.3 *non est Sparta lapidibus circumdata: ibi muros habet, ubi uiros*, Seneca, *Tro.* 126 *tu murus eras*. Seneca, *Suas.* 2.3 can be set aside. We have a tragic phrase that had entered the general first-century A. D. poetic language.

16. 496 The *ThLL*, VII 2, fasc. 8 (1974), 1205. 57-61, puts in the company of Silius' *leui nisu . . . currens* only Lucretius 4. 905-6 *multaque . . . commouet atque leui sustollit machina nisu* and Paneg. 10.12.7 *naugia . . . leui . . . commota nisu ducentium*. Hasty conclusions about literary relationship would, however, be unwise. The whole syntagm, instrumental *nisu* + adjective, should be considered. We find it twice in Virgil's *Aeneid* (3. 37 *maiore . . . nisu*, 11. 852 *rapido . . . nisu*) but not at all in the epic poems of Manilius, Ovid, Lucan, Valerius or Statius. Seneca's tragedies have it once (*Ag.* 439 *nisu . . . alterno*), doubtlessly drawing on tragic tradition (cf. Pacuvius, *Trag.* 256 *sedato nisu*). A grandiose tone made it attractive to some historians (cf. Livy 42.65.10 *maiori nisu* [Kreyssig (*maioris sinu*)] *libratum funditor habena rotaret*, Curtius 7.9.9 *hastas certo ictu, utpote libero nisu, mittit*, 8.9.28 *sagittae . . . quas emittunt maiore nisu quam effectum*, Ammianus 14.2 6 *nisu ualido* [14.11.1, 15.10 4, 29 5. 45], 25. 1. 17 *nisu . . . acerrimo* [29.6.11]; it is absent from Sallust and Tacitus). Silius has it very frequently. It is as likely that he got *leui nisu* and *uno . . . nisu* (13.205 = Lucretius 5.506) from his historical sources as that he had read the *De rerum natura* with any care.

Copyright © 1988 H. D. Jocelyn

G.B.A.Fletcher (Gosforth, Newcastle upon Tyne): *On passages in Lucan.*

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 133-136

1. 81 *laetis . . . rebus*. Getty and Wuilleumier and Le Bonniac call this an Ovidian phrase and cite two instances of it in him. Cf. Virg. *A.* 2.783 and Sen. *D.* 12.5.5..

1. 97 *exiguum dominos commisit asylum*. Sen. *D.* 5.33.1 *haec (sc. pecunia) . . . patres liberosque committit*.

1.184-5 *animo . . . ceperat*. Ov. *M.* 11.118.

1.189 *caesarie*. Getty says that this word is used of woman's hair at Virg. *G.* 4.337. Before Lucan it is so used also at Catullus 66.8, Ov. *A.* 3.1.32, *M.* 4.492.

1.216 *huc usque*. Getty refers to Lejay's remark that this use of *huc usque* is first found in Seneca. It is in Lucr. 3.252, Val. Max. 4.7.4., Mela 1.19, 2.67, 83.

1.264-5 *iustos Fortuna laborat | esse ducis motus*. Getty repeats the quotation of Justin 28.3.10 and 36.1.7 for the accusative and infinitive construction. Willeumier and Le Bonniec add Sen. *Ep.* 124.1. Cf. also Varro *R.R.* 3.17.1.

1.292 *in bellum prono*. Getty repeats Lejay's observation that this construction had already been used by Horace and Livy. It is in Ovid *F.* 1.397 and *M.* 6.459-60.

1.319 *iussam seruire*. Juv. 7.41 *seruire iubetur*.

1.410 *alternis uicibus*. Willeumier and Le Bonniec say '*souvenir d'Ovide P.4.2.6 per alternas . . . uices*'. Cf. Manil. 1.258 *alternis uicibus*.

2.24 *exigit ad saeuos famularum bracchia planctus*. Christ conjectured *erigit*. Cf. Stat. *Theb.* 1.215-6 *quonam usque nocentum | exigar in poenas*. On Lucan and Statius see *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* edited by C. Deroux, Brussels, Vol. 4, 1986, 524-5.

2.146 *ira ruit*. Sen. *H.F.* 1167 *ruat ira in omnes*.

2.204 *dubia . . . labant ceruice*. Sen. *Ag.* 787 *dubia labat ceruice*.

2.373 *duro . . . admisit gaudia uultu*. Sen. *Tro.* 588 *animosa nullos mater admittit metus*.

3.130 *non feret e nostro sceleratus praemia miles*. Bentley conjectured *sancto*. Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 8.9 *negat fortuita in nostro habenda*, 108.27 *dies placeat et redigatur in nostrum*.

3.414-5 *ipse situs putrique facit iam robore pallor | attonitos*. Heinsius conjectured *squalor*. Cf. Ov. *M.* 8.760 *coepere ac longi pallorem ducere rami*. *Vitr.* 6.4.1 *pallore uolumina corrumpunt*.

3.429-30 *uerenda | maiestate*. Ov. *M.* 4.540.

3.459-60 *telluris inanes . . . sinus*. Sen. *Oed.* 969 *inanes sinus*.

3.553-4 *habiles . . . lacescere . . . temptare*. Stat. *Theb.* 4.225 *habiles . . . resonare*.

3.607 *tenet ille dolorem*. Haskins says that he can not find any passage where *tenere* is used quite in the same sense. Sen. *D.* 6.1.5 *teneas licet et amplexeris dolorem tuum*.

3.707-8 *multus sua uulnera puppi | adfixit moriens*. Heinsius conjectured *uiscera*. Cf. Ov. *M.* 15.92-3 *mandere saevo uulnera dente iuuat*.

4.2 *Martem . . . non multa caede nocentem*. Bentley conjectured *rubentem*. Cf. 9.269-70 *nocentes | caede manus*. Ov. *P.* 2.9.67 *caede nocens*.

4.253 *in faciem ponere ducum*. Ov. *A.* 3.1.5 *me legat in sponsi facie*.

4.284 *ira ferox*. Ov. *M.* 11.323.

4.300 *micuere . . . fontes*. Sen. *Oed.* 345-6 *micat cruor*.

4.491 *perit . . . uirtus*. Ov. *F.* 2.227.

4.796 *non tulit adflictis animam producere rebus*. Housman quotes Ov. *Ep.* 5.12 *seruo nubere nympha tuli* but says of Val. Max. 4.1. ext. 9 *gratias agere populo Romano non dissimulanter tulit 'non confido'*. He quotes, as Kempf had done before him, Cic. *leg. agr.* 2.93 *uultum Considi uidere ferendum uix erat*. Cf. also Val. Max. 6.2.4. *omnis generis hominum licentiae ludibrio esse quieta fronte tulit*.

From P. Barratt's commentary on the fifth book, published in 1979, on which see R. Mayer in *CR* 95 (1981), pp. 116-7 and P. H. Schrijvers in *Mnem.* Ser. 4, 36 (1983), pp. 431-3, I give a selection of faulty notes: 274 she says that Virgil never says *satis est*, 277 she mentions but does not correct Austin's statement that Virgil was the first to use *en* with a nominative, 302-3 she says that *gaudeo* with an infinitive, which is in Sen. *Ep.* 6.4 and Quint. 1.2.30, is not found in prose until Tacitus, 318 she says that *dicto* in the sense of 'dictate', which is to be seen in Ov. *A.* 2.5.33 *dolor linguae dictauit*, is not found until post-Augustan literature, 424 *polus* meaning *caelum* is said to be first found in the poetry of the Augustan age, 604 *abstrusas penitus* she quotes Manil. 2.766 but not Cic. *leg. agr.* 22.49, *de dom.* 25 or *Acad.* 2.32, 652 *scopulosus* is found in Nep. *Att.* 10.6 and Manil. 2.224 but she does not know it in poetry before Lucan or in prose before Lucan except in Cicero. Some of the other erroneous or misleading notes are on 38, 44, 46, 130, 150, 169, 225, 301, 323, 333, 377, 379, 433, 439, 447, 475, 483, 562, 742, 776.

5. 59 *Fortuna . . . pudor*. Ov. *M.* 8.157.

5.169-70 *aliena . . . colla*. Sall. *Cat.* 37.1 *aliena mens*.

5.195-6 *quietem . . . tenebis*. Sen. *Oed.* 785 *quietem . . . obtinet*.

- 5.205 *tot fata tenentur*. Sil.4.731 *cur fata tenemus*.  
 5.304 *medios properat temptare furores*. Ciris 258 *properas nostros nouisse furores*.  
 5.312-3 *per omne fas nefasque rues*. Hor. *Carm.*1.3.26 *ruit per uetitum nefas*.  
 5.330 *impulsi . . . belli*. D.Brut. *Fam.*11.20.2, Tac. *Agr.*26.1.  
 5.504 *soluerat armorum fessias nox languida curas*. Bentley conjectured *fessis* and Schaefer conjectured *fessus . . . curis*. Cf. Ciris 232-3 *tempore quo fessas mortalia pectora curas | . . . requiescunt*, Stat. *Silu.*5.1.8 *curas . . . fatigat*, Sil.1.675 *curas . . . fatigant*, 12.496.  
 5.508 *uasta silentia*. Livy 10.34.6 *uastum silentium*.  
 5.699 *dominus rerum*. Virg. *A.*1.282.  
 5.734 *pulso torpore quietis*. Barratt quotes Culex.198 *somni languore remoto* but not Lucil.391 *torpor . . . quietis*.  
 5.778 *posse pati timeo*. Ov. *M.*10.25 *posse pati uolui*.  
 6.110-1 *cernit miserabile uulgus | in pecudum cecidisse cibos*. Duff gives the surprising translation 'saw his wretched men lying on the ground to eat the food of beasts' which is repeated by R.Graves. What Lucan says is simply 'saw his wretched men reduced to eating the food of beasts'. Cf. Sen. *H.O.* 334-5 *in famulae locum regina cecidit*.  
 6.174 *contraria pectora*. Ov. *A.*2.110.31.  
 6.224 *imbre cruento*. Sen. *Oed.*978.  
 6.280 *inuenit impulsos presso iam puluere muros*. Heinsius conjectured *spisso*. Cf. Ov. *Med.*90 *puluis ab infuso melle premendus erit*.  
 6.414-5 *belli praesage futuri | mens*. Virg. *A.*10.843 *praesage mali mens*.  
 6.450 *omne uetustorum soluat penetrabile magorum*. Burman conjectured *uoluat*. Cf. Stat. *Theb.*4.477 *soluti pulsanti loca muta*.  
 6.772 *pauet ire*. Ov. *M.*1.386-7 *pauet . . . laedere*, Tac. *G.*7.  
 7.46 *fatis . . . trahentibus orbem*. Sen. *H.F.*307 *omnes trahe*, *H.O.*884.  
 7.248-9 *formidine mersa | prosilit*. Burman conjectured *missa*. Cf. Sen. *Oed.*798 *mersus . . . timor*.  
 7.546-7 *totos errore uago perfuderat agros*. Sil.15.300-1 *Ambracios . . . sinus Olpaeaeque litora bello perfudit rapido*.  
 7.674-5 *socero spectare uolenti | praestandum est ubicumque caput*. Postgate translates *ubicumque* by 'everywhere' and compares Ov. *A.*3.10.5 where presumably he read *ubicumque* but not everyone does so. Dilke speaks of ellipse of the verb of the dependent clause. *ubicumque* means 'somewhere' as it does in Sen. *N.Q.*6.7.5 *necesse est mori ubicumque, quandoque*.  
 7.771 *triste . . . poenas*. Oct.811.  
 8.28-9 *uita superstes | imperio*. R.Mayer in his useful commentary on the eighth book quotes Livy 2.7.8 *superstes gloriae suae*, Plin. *Ep.*2.1.2 *gloriae suae superuixit* and Florus 2.13.51 *superstes dignitatis suae* but not Cic. *Q.fr.*1.3.1 *non solum uitae sed etiam dignitatis meae superstitem*.  
 8.37 *remis quatitur Corcyra*. Mayer rightly says that Corcyra must mean the waters of Corcyra. Cf. Ov. *Ep.*18.48 *quasque quatit nulla parte coercescunt aquas*.  
 8.55 *crimen . . . deum crudele notauit*. Mayer says that *notauit* in the sense of *conspexit* is used in Ovid. It is also so used by others also; for example cf. Cic. *de diuin.*1.126, Livy 5.47.2, 27.41.1, Cels.5.28 2E, Plin. *N.H.*16.117.  
 8.120 *certa loci*. Mayer says that *certus* meaning 'having some knowledge of' first takes the genitive in literature at Ov. *M.*13.722 *futurorum certi*. Cf. Cic. *Att.*8.11.D.1 *certior tui consili*, 9.2.A.2 *certiorem . . . sui consili*.  
 8.136-7 *uenia committere uobis | materiam*. Cf. Ov. *T.*2.32 *materiam ueniae sors tibi nostra dedit*. Mayer omits this from his list of phrases recalled from Ovid and omits also Ov. *T.*1.4.41-2 *non contraria foui | arma* at 8.519 *tua fouimus arma*.  
 8.179 *quidquid descendet*. For *quidquid* with the sense of *in quantum* Mayer refers to Livy 7.32.6 and 21.54.8. Cf. Catullus 56.3 *ride quidquid amas . . . Catullum*, Caes. *B.G.*2.17.4, Cic.

*Fam.* 2.4.2. *hoc, quidquid attigi*, Virg. *A.* 11.288, Ov. *Rem.* 247.

**8.335** *transfuga*. Of this word Mayer says that it finds no place in poetry. It is given one in Hor. *Carm.* 3.16.23, Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.203, Mart. 14.131.2 and Claud. in *Eutrop.* 1.15.

**8.468** *nocti . . . rependit | lux minor hibernae uerni solacia damni*. Mayer remarks that *solacium* meaning 'compensation' is also found in Tacitus. It is also found in Livy 39.28.4 *solacium iniuriae*.

**8.508-9** *gentes quas uno in sanguine mixtas | deseruit*. Mayer remarks that *sanguis* here means 'slaughter' and cites Sen. *N. Q.* 1.17.3 *omen . . . futuri sanguinis*. This use of the word with reference to bloodshed is not rare and earlier than Seneca. Cf. Cic. *Fam.* 15.15.1 *odio ciuilis sanguinis*, Tul. 42, Livy 9.13.5 *plus quam in acie sanguinis ac caedis factum*.

**8.582** *surda uetanti*. Sen. *Ep.* 85.8 *surda suadenti*, Sil. 11.352 *surdum . . . timori*.

**8.634** *clude . . . gemitus*. Livy 44.45.12 *horum ferocia uocem Euandri clausit*.

**8.636** *ius hoc animi morientis habebat*. Manil. 2.465 *Pisces . . . pedum sibi iura repossunt*.

**8.850** *feret tua busta*. For the meaning of *busta* cf. Prop. 4.7.34, Stat. *Theb.* 12.248.

**9.81** *terrae . . . nocenti | non haerere queror*. Ov. *F.* 6.473 *a nupta quereris . . . relinqui*, Sen. *Med.* 623-4 *carinas stare querentes*.

**9.111** *saeuum . . . arte complexa dolorem*. Sen. *D.* 6.1.5 *amplexeris dolorem tuum*.

**9.138** *ora ducis . . . transfixo sublimia pilo*. Virg. *A.* 11.645-6 *hasta . . . duplicat . . . uirum transfixa dolore*.

**9.146-7** *non in gemitus lacrimasque dolorem effudit*. Justin 1.8.9 *in lacrimas dolorem effudit*.

**9.262** *nescis sine rege pati*. Sen. *Thy.* 470 *immane regnum est posse sine rege pati*.

**9.668** *auerso sulcantem regna uolatu*. Housman remarks that *sulcantem* is not used 'satis proprie'. Cf. Sen. *Contr.* 10.5.28 *Triptoleum qui iunctis draconibus sulcauit auras*.

**9.686** *si medias Europae scinderet urbes*. Housman remarks of *scinderet* that it is not used 'satis proprie'. Cf. Sil. 13.238 *uolucris liquidas ceu scinderet auras*.

**10.83-4** *simulatum comptas dolorem | qua decuit*. Berman said 'construe *compta*, *qua decuit dolorem simulatum*. *dolorem* is not object of *decuit*. Cf. Ov. *P.* 3.3.16 *nec bene dispositas comptus, ut ante, comas*.

**10.131** *sanguinis usti*. For *sanguinis* meaning 'complexion' cf. Ov. *A. A.* 2.658 *nigrior Illyrica cui pice sanguis erit*.

**10.459** *quaerit tuta domus*. Virg. *A.* 11.882 *tuta deorum*.

Copyright © G.B.A. Fletcher

R. Brock (St Andrews): *The courts in 411*

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988, 136-139)

One of the minor mysteries of the events of 411 B.C. is the question of what became of the courts. The evidence is extremely sparse and its interpretation inevitably rather conjectural, but perhaps more can be made of it than hitherto.

The administration of justice under the Four Hundred is not particularly obscure: as in the political sphere, the council of 400 seems effectively to have arrogated all powers to itself and acted without reference to any other body (Thuc. 8.70.2, 92.2; Lys. 6.27; Andoc. 2.13-15 n.b. P.J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* [Oxford 1972], 185; if D. 23.66 is taken literally, the Areopagus retained its limited homicide brief, not impossible given right-wing enthusiasm for that institution). This is echoed by the practice of the Thirty, who made the boule the only court (X. *HG.* 2.3.12, 23f.; Lys. 13.35-8 cp. 13.12, 30.10f.; Rhodes op.cit. 181; Bonner, *CP* 21 [1926], 209-17). Those excluded from the Three Thousand received no trial (X. *HG.* 2.3.51; *Ath. Pol.* 37.1); the extermination of the Eleusinians (X. *HG.* 2.4.8-10) was a mixture of pseudo-judicial lynching (guaranteed by Spartan arms) and one of those bonds of complicity beloved of oligarchic clubs (cf. Thuc. 8.73.3, Pl. *Apol.* 32c and n.b. Andocides' account of the Herm affair) and in any case only came when the regime was collapsing. Apparently the administration of civil justice was suspended entirely (Lys. 17.3; Isocr. 21.7) and there are



hints that the deficiency was supplied by arbitration, to the advantage of friends of the regime (Lys.25.16 with Bonner art. cit. 217; n.b. the reference to arbitration in the law cited at Andoc.1.87 and D.24.56). All this is accordance with practice in Sparta and most other oligarchies (D.M. MacDowell, *Spartan Law* [Edinburgh 1986], 126-35; L. Whibley, *Greek Oligarchies* (London 1896), 170-77).

The position after the fall of the Four Hundred is much more obscure. There are certainly records of trials beginning shortly after the takeover by the Five Thousand, and the implication of Polystratus' remarks is that prosecutions of those implicated in the oligarchy continued, not always successfully, into the restored democracy (Antiphon and Archeptolemus: Lys.12.67, Antiphon fr.1-6; Pisander: Jameson, *Historia* 20 [1971], 541-68; posthumous prosecution of Phrynichus: Lycurg.112f.; Polystratus: Lys.20 esp.11, 14, 18, 22; others: Lys.20.7, 14-5, 21, 25.25-7 and implied by Andoc.1.75, 78 and perhaps Thuc.8.68.2 [Jameson art. cit. 554, 566-8, but n.b. HCT V ad loc.]). Unfortunately these special trials are the only ones recorded for the period, and it is impossible to deduce from them anything about the regular administration of justice, since *eisangelia* is the only procedure attested in the witch-hunts (Jameson art. cit. 557-8). There are some indications of a fresh judicial beginning with the restoration of democracy in 410 (Andoc.1.75-6, 96-8), and Polystratus provides a case of an individual being prosecuted under the democracy as well as under the Five Thousand (though it has been suggested that the second trial might be a resumption of proceedings which had lapsed due to the interregnum [Gernet, cited in HCT V 203]). Not much can be made of the fact that Antiphon and Polystratus' advocate refer to juries under the Five Thousand as *ἑμείς* as if, like democratic juries, they represented the whole people (Antiphon fr.1a; Lys.20.21-2); not only would there have been a tendency to use the normal rhetorical convention (and Antiphon might have regarded the Five Thousand as 'outright democracy' anyway), but neither had anything to gain from becoming involved in discussions of constitutionality. One further point of ignorance is that from about 415, when the *kolokretai* disappear from the epigraphic record, we do not know who was responsible for paying jurors (Meiggs and Lewis, *GHI* p.258 and literature cited there).

Given such a dearth of positive evidence, we may perhaps be permitted a little speculation based on hints and arguments from silence. To take silence first: remarkable though it may seem, there is no mention in the sources, and particularly in the programme of *Ath. Pol.* 30-31 (which like Andrewes [HCT V 242f.] and Rhodes [Commentary 365] I take to have originated in 411), of any provision concerning the judiciary in the revolution of 411. It is not simply that one might expect the long-term constitutional arrangements to make provision for the administration of justice; given the identification of the courts with the sovereign demos (K.J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality* [Oxford 1974], 292, cp. *Ar. Eq.* passim, esp. 50-51, 798, 1089, *Vesp.* passim esp. 917 with MacDowell ad loc.), the view of democratic licence on the part of the jurors which Aristophanes' *Wasps* implies, and the sheer cost of the system (*Vesp.* 663 with MacDowell), such an omission would be remarkable on ideological grounds. A possible solution is to suggest that provision was indeed made, but has been camouflaged in the sources, in other words that the Five Thousand were to be both the assembly and the jurors, a natural convergence given that both were identified with the demos; given the preoccupations of the contemporary sources, it would not be surprising if the restriction of the suffrage in all respects was reported in terms of its political aspect. In that case, the status quo ante would have been restored in the courts when the franchise was restored to the whole demos.

The assembly had continued to retain traces of its Solonian character as a law court ('The demos sitting in its judicial capacity as the undivided *ἡλικία*', Rhodes, *Athenian Boule*, 168; n.b. M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* [Berkeley 1986], 9-12, 28-35), particularly in matters of national importance such as treason and sacrilege. Thus it retained until c.360 B.C. the power to try *eisangeliai* (M.H. Hansen, *Eisangelia* [Odense 1975], 51-7) and formed the court in the trial of Pheidias (Plut. *Per.* 31.2 – for *hierosylia*?). In

the 5th century, however, this power was used sparingly: besides the trial of Pheidias, we know of two definite *eisangelia* proceedings before the assembly before 415, against Miltiades in 489 (Hdt.6.136.1; the specific charge of misleading the people seems to have been separately procedurally defined at some stage by the 'decree of Cannonus' [X.HG.1.7.20 with Marchant & Underhill's commentary p.332, Ar. *Eccl.*1089-90]), as well as one probable case, that of the ten Hellenotamiai mentioned in Antiphon 5.69-70 (see Gernet ad loc.), presumably for embezzlement of public funds. By contrast Hansen (op. cit. 51 and n.1) lists 9 *eisangeliai* before the people between 406 and 362, though the Arginusae trial should probably not strictly be regarded as an *eisangelia*. One would expect evidence of a transition, and indications of a change in attitude can perhaps be found. Even when it did not form the jury, the assembly would often be involved in the investigation of matters of public importance, particularly if they involved *μήνους* in exchange for immunity (Ostwald op. cit. 54 n.210). In 415 it became involved in a huge investigation following the Herm and Mysteries affairs. Both urgency and practicality called for the involvement of the courts, but the assembly was able to deal by decree with those who had avoided trial (Plut. *Alc.*22.4, Thuc.6.60.4, 61.7; cp. the outlawing of Diagoras [Ostwald, op. cit. 275-6]), and the juries in these trials may have been large quasi-assemblies, to judge by the jury of 6000 attested for an associated *graphe paranomon* (Andoc.1.17); the figure is not only the whole panel of jurors but also the minimum for a quorate assembly (And.1.87, D.224.45-6, 59.89, Plut. *Arist.*7). Similarly the investigations in 404-3 associated with Agoratus (Lys.13.32-3) and Menestratus (Lys.13.55, 86) were heard by the assembly, which in the former case voted that those denounced by Agoratus should be tried 'in court before two thousand jurors', another abnormally large panel (13.55; n.b. also the panel of 1500 proposed by Hagnon to hear Pericles' *euthyna* [Plut. *Per.*32.2]). Again, the Arginusae trial, for all its irregularity, reflects the same tendency for the demos to reassert direct judicial control over matters of national importance. Such ideas of a close link between the judicial and political activity of the assembly are likely to have been current in 411, and could be turned to oligarchic account by the stipulation that such citizen-jurors should be the 'responsible' element; the assembly's activity in 406, 404 and the early 4th century are the other side of the coin.

Secondly, it might be suggested that jury-pay was suspended by the provision reported in *Ath. Pol.*29.5 that no *δοχή* other than the archons and prytanes should receive pay (the juries were technically not an *δοχή*, but n.b. Ar. *Vesp.*575, 587, 619, Plut.916-7 and Arist. *Pol.*1275a26f.). As has already been observed, it is unclear who was paying the jurors in early 411, though it is easiest to suppose that the *kolakretai* were abolished by the Four Hundred. At any rate, if their role was taken over by the Hellenotamiai, as the popular theory has it (e.g. stated without further qualification by Ostwald, op. cit. 383 and n.166), and if one further accepts the suggestion of Andrewes (*JHS* 73 [1953], 5f.) that individual Hellenotamiai came to have specialised functions. then it would seem that no-one was paying the courts for at least the first five prytanies of 410-09 as recorded in Meiggs and Lewis *GHI* no.84, a time when one would expect prosecutions of the oligarchs, if nothing else. Apparently jury-pay had not yet been restored; one might have expected that Aristophanic jurors would have refused to serve under such conditions, but it may have been argued that the treason trials, since they concerned the city as a whole, were a matter for the whole citizen body rather than simply the registered jurors, and if judicial activity ran on from the government of the Five Thousand, it may have been a little while, perhaps as late as the beginning of the following archon-year, before a new register of jurors and all the associated machinery was properly restored. In any case, a different attitude to jury-pay seems to have been emerging, for although restored, unlike other state pay it now ceased to keep pace with inflation (Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 13; Dover, op. cit. 34-5) and so promoted a change in the composition of juries, increasing the representation of the more prosperous at the expense of the poor thetes. Failures in all else, the oligarchs may after all have left their mark on the jury system.

Copyright © 1988 R.Brock.

Herodotus' tale of Pythius the Lydian (7.27-29; 38-39) frames the famous episode where Xerxes lashes the Hellespont. In the first half of the story, Xerxes reached Celaenae on his march from Critalla to Sardis, and there he encountered Pythius, son of Atys, apparently a Mermnad, who entertained his army and offered all his wealth in gold and silver to the king. Not to be outdone in competitive gift giving, Xerxes rewarded Pythius with seven thousand staters. In the second part, as the army left Sardis in the spring of 480 B.C., there was an eclipse of the sun which troubled Xerxes, but the Magi gave him a pleasant interpretation. However, Pythius was so terrified by the eclipse that he asked Xerxes to release the eldest of his five sons who were serving in his army. Xerxes wrathfully ordered Pythius' eldest son found, his body split in two, the two halves placed on either side of the road, and the army to march between them.

The parallel with the Oebazus story (Hdt.4.84) has long been noted: Oebazus, a Persian, begged Darius to excuse one of his three sons from the Scythian expedition, and Darius slew all three. However, the ceremony of splitting the bodies does not appear in the tale. The artistic significance has also been noted: to give two examples only: Immerwahr<sup>1</sup> has pointed to the incident as an example of how Xerxes rewarded and punished his subjects to excess, and Flory<sup>2</sup> notes it as an example of Xerxes' 'combination of kindness and savagery'. But the significance of splitting the corpse of Pythius' eldest son has gone unremarked, although How and Wells<sup>3</sup> point to two examples from the Old Testament, in *Genesis* and *Jeremiah*<sup>4</sup>, both having to do with sealing a covenant, and Speiser<sup>5</sup>, in his commentary on *Genesis*, noted that part of the ritual followed by Abraham in making his covenant with Yahweh has parallels in Akkadian texts dealing with magic.

There is, however, a close parallel which has not been noticed, as far as I am aware. Among the stories of the Christian martyrs in Sassanid Persia, there is one: the martyrdom of Tarbo, her sister and her servant, who were put to death under Shapur II, which presents an interesting analogy<sup>6</sup>. The queen had fallen ill, and Tarbo and her co-religionists were accused of putting a magic spell upon her. They were interrogated in the queen's palace by the Mobed and two officers, all of whom made sexual advances to the women, and when they were rejected, they returned the verdict that the women were, indeed, witches. The Magi then ordered the bodies of the women to be split in two, and the queen was to pass between the two halves, after which she would be healed.

How and Wells remarked that the whole story of Pythius 'has the look of a legend'. Possibly so: the story of Tarbo does not prove the authenticity of the Pythius-story. However, the ritual that Xerxes followed seems to have been authentic enough, and it was designed to remove the ill omen that Pythius had cast upon the expedition. The Magian interpretation of the eclipse may have pleased Xerxes, but it did not make him proof against the superstitious fear that Pythius' alarm reopened. The pessimism and lack of faith that his frightened request for his eldest son implied did more than express doubt. It cast a 'hex' on the campaign, and a ritual prescription was necessary to clear it away<sup>7</sup>.

Copyright © 1988 J.A.S.Evans

<sup>1</sup> Henry R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland, O., 1966), p.182.

<sup>2</sup> Stewart Flory, *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit 1987), p.59.

<sup>3</sup> W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus II* (Oxford 1928), p.145.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. 14.10, 17; Jer. 34.18, 19.

<sup>5</sup> E. A. Speiser, *The Anchor Bible: Genesis* (New York 1964), p.113.

<sup>6</sup> P. Peeters (ed.), *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis* (Bruxelles 1910), no.1149, now available in *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, trans. Sebastian P. Brock and Susan Ashbrook Harvey (Berkeley, Calif., 1987), pp.73-76.

<sup>7</sup> The Macedonian army had a rite of purification held each spring in honour of the god or hero Xandos, where the army was paraded ceremonially between the two parts of a dog which had been sacrificed: see Charles F. Edson, 'Early Macedonia' in *Ancient Macedonia. Papers read at the First International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, 26-28 August, 1968* (Thessaloniki 1970), p.23. This was a ceremonial lustration, however, and involved a sacrificial animal, not a human being who might be regarded as the bearer of bad luck.

T.J.Leary ( Worcester College, Oxford): *Medicamina recalled*

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec), 140-142

*This article has been taken, with a good deal of reorganisation, from the introduction of my Oxford MSt dissertation, a commentary on the Medicamina. My supervisor, Mr A.S.Hollis, and my examiners, Dr M.Winterbottom and Dr R.B.Rutherford, all commented helpfully on the thesis and I owe a great deal to their proddings. None of them, however, has had anything to do with the preparation of this paper, for which I am solely culpable.*

*I have not seen Giampetro Rosati's recent edition and commentary (Venice 1985), but, since I gather it is a handy little book, I draw the attention of readers to it.*

When discussing Ovid's *Medicamina* L.P. Wilkinson writes: 'The subject chosen by Ovid was cosmetics . . . , and after fifty clever and spirited lines of introduction he plunges into a series of versified recipes . . . It is hardly a matter of regret that after a further fifty lines our manuscripts break off. One would like to think that Ovid broke off too . . . What can have induced him to embark on such a poem? He was not a tasteless bore . . .'<sup>1</sup>

In this article I propose to reexamine the factors which may have prompted Ovid to write the *Medicamina* in the hope of encouraging attitudes to the poem more sympathetic than Wilkinson's. Ovid was indeed not a 'tasteless bore', and although Homer might have nodded, he did not pass out completely.

It seems most natural to begin at *Ars* 3.205-6 *est mihi, quo dixi, vestrae medicamina formae, I parvus, sed cura grande, libellus, opus*. From this we can safely deduce that the poem was completed and published. We know that it was a short poem, and given the subject matter, this was no doubt necessary for fear of boring readers (I am not saying, please note, that Ovid did bore his readers; merely that he took precautions not to). The poem cannot have been very substantially longer than the hundred lines which survive. Finally, we know that Ovid spent a good deal of trouble over the work. Since he was probably versifying a prose treatise, and one containing subject matter intractable to the poet, he would not be exaggerating here in saying how much work it was, metaphrastic composition posing a formidable technical challenge.

So much for the certain knowledge to be derived from these lines. But it seems to me also that the tone of the *est mihi* is consciously offhand, as if Ovid is taking care not to sound too boastful in advertising his own work, that, in spite of modern views, he was not altogether ashamed of the work<sup>2</sup>.

If I am right, it appears that this is an instance where the modern reader should put aside his own expectations and literary values and try to put on those of someone living in the high society of Augustan Rome. It is with this in mind that I proceed.

Ovid's recourse to mock-didactic comes naturally in his development as a poet: the view that his treatment of love elegy in the *Amores* brought the tradition to an end and delivered the death blow to the genre has wide acceptance<sup>3</sup>, and I think comes close to the truth. Certainly, Ovid could not have continued writing love elegy without becoming tedious (and he was not a tedious bore), and at the same time finding it limiting. Hence his refuge in the *Heroides*, a form of writing which he is proud to claim as his own invention (*Ars* 3.346) and

<sup>1</sup> L.P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge 1955, reprinted Bath 1974, p.118.

<sup>2</sup> I say this despite B.Effe, *Dichtung und Lehre*, Munich 1977, who remarks (p.238 and n.2) that this statement is in accordance with Alexandrian and Callimachean tradition. Our two observations need not, I think, be mutually exclusive.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. J.Barsby, *Amores* 1, p.17 n.2; R.Maltby, *Latin Love Elegy*, Bristol 1983, p.13. Brooks Otis (*Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge 1966, ch.2 'The Limitations of the Elegist') discusses the matter in some detail.

With this paragraph and the two which follow, compare Howard Jacobson, *Ovid's Heroides*, Princeton 1974, p.6, and Effe, op.cit. in n.2, pp.238ff..

which provided him with renewed scope. But here again he was working within the subjective frame of traditional elegy, although at the same time, as in the *Amores*, reacting to the tradition.

Having exhausted the possibilities offered by the *Heroides*, his turning to mock-didactic provided him with further opportunities to go on writing about women and love, again in a novel way and with even more detachment than before. In addition, it provided a natural and clever expansion of one of the common themes of love elegy, that of the *praeceptor amoris*.

Different, but related to the question of Ovid's poetic development is the possibility of influence by other poets: in the *Tristia*, Ovid gives a list of the poets he admired and followed as a young man, in which he writes *saepe suas volucres legit mihi grandior aevo, | quaeque nocet serpens, quae iuvat herba, Macer, | . . .* (*Tristia* 4.10.43-4). Not much of Aemilius Macer's work survives, but it seems probable from its subject matter (line 44) that he was writing in the tradition of Nicander and other such poets, and it is possible that his influence on Ovid paved the way for a poem such as the *Medicamina*. This, however, is speculative and I do not propose to press the point further.

So much then for possible 'developmental reasons' to explain Ovid's writing a poem like the *Medicamina*. But there are other reasons why such an undertaking would have appealed for its own sake.

As Ovid himself tells us, he was by no means the first to write a frivolous poem in the didactic manner: *Tristia* 2.471ff., especially 485f.<sup>4</sup>

*ecce canit formas alius iactusque pilarum,  
hic artem nandi praecipit, ille t rochi  
composita est aliis fucandi cura coloris;  
hic epulis leges hospitioque dedit;  
alter humum, de qua fingantur pocula, monstrat,  
quaeque, docet, liquido testa sit apta mero.  
(491) talia luduntur fumoso mense Decembri,  
quae damno nulli composuisse fuit.*

Evidently there was a taste for such literature and a fairly extensive tradition, otherwise he would not have tried his hand. That such poems were considered light-hearted and entertaining is made quite clear to us by line 491. And to be entertaining was Ovid's intention.

In addition, Ovid's genre and chosen subject matter would have appealed to his fancy. Although he ends the poem by denying the effectiveness of cosmetics, his very handling of the subject<sup>5</sup> might have caused offence in certain circles: cosmetics were associated with women generally regarded as rather common or of dubious virtue<sup>6</sup>. But others of Ovid's reading public would have been filled with glee at the poet's audacity. Ovid would have enjoyed both shocking and delighting<sup>7</sup>.

Similar reactions would have been prompted by Ovid's writing in the tradition of one of Augustus' major poets. Although the debts of the *Medicamina* to the *Georgics* are perhaps less than those of the *Ars Amatoria*<sup>8</sup>, there are enough in Ovid's treatment of *cultus* (which receives similar

<sup>4</sup> It is possibly worth mentioning Ennius' *Hedyphagetica* at this point, a poem concerned with luxury dishes. What survives deals with fish.

<sup>5</sup> P.Green (*AJPh* 100 [1979], pp.390ff.; cf. his Penguin translation p.428) seems to think that Ovid wrote the *Medicamina* simply because he happened to know about cosmetics and to be interested in them. This must be partly true, at least in so far as choice of subject-matter is concerned, but I am very hesitant when Green goes on to suggest that Ovid therefore intended his didactic pieces to be taken seriously.

<sup>6</sup> Wilkinson, op.cit. in n.1, p.119; A.F.Sabot, *Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse*, Paris 1975, p.401.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Wilkinson, op.cit. in n.1, p.294; E.J.Kenney in N.I.Herescu, ed., *Ovidiana*, Paris 1958, p.209 n.2.

<sup>8</sup> For Ovid's debt to the *Georgics* when writing the *Ars*, see E.W.Leach, 'Georgic imagery in the *Ars Amatoria*', *TAPhA* 95 (1965), pp.142-154; Kenney, op.cit. in n.7, pp.201-209; see also, less importantly, Effe, op.cit. in n.2, p.240.



treatment in *Ars* 3, lines 1021ff.<sup>9</sup>) to have caused ripples both of indignation and delight attractive to the poet.

Finally, and this is to return in part to what I said earlier of Ovid's poetic development, the appeal to the Roman reader of his innovation and cleverness in applying the metre, themes and conventions of love elegy to another, more serious genre, must not be underestimated. Such literary cleverness would have been appreciated and applauded<sup>10</sup>.

This applies too to the difficulties of metaphrastic composition. The lines of the *Medicamina* most likely to bore form the second half of the poem – those giving recipes for cosmetic preparations. Had Ovid gone to great lengths and given many recipes, he would, no doubt, have bored his contemporaries. But he did not (*parvus . . . opus*).

Instead, he would have written just enough to show off, and delight his readers with, his not inconsiderable skill in versifying such unpoetic material as numbers<sup>11</sup> and ingredients. The attraction of such cleverness for the Roman reader is not to be underestimated.

To conclude, then, while it might be granted that the *Medicamina* has conceivably not the merit and appeal of other Ovidian works, we modern readers do Ovid a very great injustice in dismissing such a poem as boring. Ovid was not writing for 20th century readers, but for people of his own day and with, sometimes, literary values differing from ours. In so doing, we can take it for granted, I think, that he had a pretty clear idea of what he was about. Consequently, far from deriving pleasure from the fact that the *Medicamina* breaks off after only a hundred lines, we should lament the fact that we cannot appreciate his efforts in full.

Copyright © 1988 T.J. Leary

P.G. Naiditch (Dept. of Special Collections, Research Library, UCLA):

*Housman's knowledge of Greek*

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 142-144

The history of this problem is brief. Prof. H.D. Jocelyn affirmed that 'Housman knew Greek more widely and more profoundly than any man in England between 1887 and 1936' (LCM 12.7, July 1987, p.108) and Mr J.T. Hooker asked him to substantiate this statement (LCM 12.8, Oct. 1987, p.128 [and as most recently, in LCM 13.8 (Oct. 1988), 128] has Professor Lloyd-Jones – Ed.). Mr Jocelyn might have made a case for his assertion, albeit perhaps not a good one, by citing the words attributed to Wilamowitz: 'Although we Germans know Housman to be a rabid Germanophobe, we, nevertheless, unanimously pronounce him to be the greatest living authority on both Latin and Greek in the English-speaking world' (A.B.M. Meakin in Grant Richards, *Housman 1897-1936*, London 1942<sup>2</sup>, p.84 n.). Mr Jocelyn chose, however, to admit in effect that he had no right to pass judgment in the matter (LCM 12.10, Nov. 1987, p.144).

Now I pass over the ambiguity of the original assertion and admit, what is important, that the question suggested by the statement is interesting as a detail in the history of classical scholarship. Was Housman the first British Greek scholar of his age? Part of that problem can be resolved.

<sup>9</sup> On this, see especially Leach, op.cit in n.8, p.146, and Kenney, op.cit in n.7, p.209. I skate over the question here as it is one I feel I can deal with better in the commentary on *Ars* 3 with which I am now busy. On the subject of Ovidian *cultus*, other works to consider are E.S. Ramage, *Urbanitas: Ancient Sophistication and Refinement*, Oklahoma 1973, and P. Watson, 'Ovid and *cultus*: *Ars Amatoria* 3.113-128', *TAPhA* 112 (1982), pp.237-244.

<sup>10</sup> In this context it is helpful to remember David West & Tony Woodman, edd., *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge 1979, perhaps especially D.A. Russell's article 'De Imitatione', and the editors' epilogue (pp.195ff.).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Med.* 87 *parte minus quarta*, which I explain elsewhere.

At least with regard to the width of his knowledge of Greek, Housman was not the most learned Greek scholar in Great Britain. But it wants emphasis that he never pretended to such a position. Moreover, he mostly ceased from writing about Greek authors in 1892. The direct result of this limitation in his work is that his opportunities for referring to Greek writers were greatly reduced, and we consequently possess less information than we might have about the extent of his readings in Greek.

The difficulties in our way may be conveniently shown from Housman's references to Sappho and Plato. It is widely known that Housman's *More Poems X* and *More Poems XI* were founded on one of Sappho's poems (G.B.A.Fletcher in Richards, *Housman 1897-1936*, p.406 n.1; N.Marlow, *A.E.Housman: Scholar and Poet*, London 1958, p.50; T.B.Haber, *A.E.Housman*, New York 1967, p.99; Anon., 'Housman and Sappho', *Farrago* Oct. 1978, p.10; P.Keyser, 'A.E.Housman's Variations on Sappho, frag 52 Bergk<sup>4</sup>', *Classical and Modern Literature* 5, Summer 1985, pp.315-22). In this case Housman's verse allows us to say that he had read at least one of her poems by Feb. 1893 (L.Housman, *A.E.H.*, London 1937, pp.258, 275 [MP X]; cf. T.B.Haber, *The Manuscript Poems of A.E.Housman*, Minneapolis 1955, p.60 [MP XI]). But if we depended on his published classical works, we could not know that. Nor, indeed, would reference to his unpublished annotations greatly advance our knowledge. So far as I know, he only once refers to Sappho's poems in a marginal note: in *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina* edd. Haupt/Vahlen<sup>4</sup>, Leipzig 1879, ad Prop.I.8.43 (St John's College, Oxford, Housman Cabinet I, row a, shelf 2). It is practically impossible therefore for us to affirm that Housman read more than one or two of Sappho's poems in Greek, however unlikely it may seem that he limited himself so.

Plato was not a writer to whom Housman often referred. But his copy of Stallbaum's *Platonis opera omnia*, Leipzig 1873, survives (Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania, Adelman Collection; cp. H.M.Last, *Oxford Magazine* 56, 1937, p.69); and he has marked seventeen dialogues in the table of contents and annotated eighteen of them in the text itself. (These annotations, perhaps I should say, mostly or wholly postdate Housman's Oxford years.) There is some correspondence between these marks and annotations and Housman's citations, but it is hardly perfect.

Thus, Housman cites but neither marks nor annotates the *Gorgias* (*Iuven.* VI 09; *Cl.Pap.* p.482), *Laws* IV and V (*Cl.Pap.* p.201; *Manil.* V p.155 respectively), the *Parmenides* (*Manil.* I p.lxxiii n.1), the *Sophist* (*Manil.* V p.156; *Letters* p.416), *Theaetetus* (University Library, Cambridge, Add. Ms 6900 f.26), and the *Timaeus* (*Manil.* I ad 207, II ad 66, IV ad 905, IV ad 907, V p.159). He annotates, but neither cites nor marks, *Laws* VI and X. He marks, but neither annotates nor cites, *Republic* I, III-V.

Housman cites and annotates, but does not mark, *Alcibiades I* (ULC 6900 f.33 [addition]) and *Phaedo* (cf. *Manil.* V ad 44; Haupt/Vahlen ad Prop.IV 22.11). He cites and marks, but does not annotate, *Laws I* (ULC 6900 f.45), *Phaedrus* (*Cl.Pap.* p.691; *Manil.* V p.119; Haupt/Vahlen ad Prop.III 34.43); and see, for his copy of the Oxford text, T.M.Knox to A.S.F.Gow, Nov. 24, 1937 [Trinity College, Cambridge, Add. Ms. a 71.157]), and *Republic II* (ULC 6887 f.57v). He annotates and marks, but does not cite, *Alcibiades II*, *Amatores*, *Crito*, *Hippias Maior*, *Menexenus*, and *Philebus* (his copy of Bury's edition is not annotated [Waseda University, Tokyo, Gow collection c 802]). It may also be remarked in passing that Housman owned *The Dialogues of Plato* translated by B.Jowett, Oxford 1875, 5 volumes (Waseda, Gow c 798/1-5), but did not annotate the set (cf. N.Page, *A.E.Housman: a Critical Biography*, New York 1983, p.146), and Henry Jackson's *Platonica*, Cambridge 1901 (ULC 9706.c.68), which shows a few notes. See also *Cl.Pap.* p.85; *Selected Prose* pp.17, 188. Since the annotations are not in Housman's hand, R.P.Graves, *A.E.Housman: the Scholar-Poet*, London 1979, p.48 is irrelevant. It consequently becomes practically impossible to prove that Housman had not read the rest of Plato or P's Plato's writings, but equally impossible to affirm that he had done so. But the evidence does not always fail us, and where it suffices, it shows that Housman on occasion failed to read the whole of works and that he sometimes failed to read some Greek

authors early in his career.

Sometimes it is possible to show that Housman had not read the whole of a work. A.S.F.Gow tells us that 'Housman, though scrupulous in meeting any possible objection in advance, never piled up evidence beyond his immediate need' (*A.E.Housman: a Sketch*, Cambridge 1936<sup>2</sup>, p.46), and Housman himself states: 'Not even an editor of Manilius is bound to read the volumes of the *C.C.A.G.*, but he is bound to skim over them (*Cl.Pap.* p.841). That Housman did not misrepresent his practice can be demonstrated from his set of the *Catalogus*: there are portions which he never opened (*C.C.A.G.* II pp.1-24, 57-72, 105-120; IV pp.25-40, 49-72; V.1 pp.9-64; V.2 pp.33-128, all at St John's College, Oxford, Housman Cabinet I, row a, shelf 1), albeit sometimes there were reasons for his neglect: e.g. he was no D.S.Margoliouth.

Moreover, it is possible to show that Housman did not always read a work early in his career. Thus, Housman himself affirms that he had not read Heliodorus by 1905 (Grant Richards, *Housman 1897-1936*, London 1942<sup>2</sup>, p.63, acknowledging a translation of book I). In his publications, Housman refers to the *Aethiopica* only twice, and both references are in quotation (*Cl.Pap.* p.118; *Manil.* V ad 554); and both of his two manuscript references were latterly added to his Cambridge Lectures on Lucan (ULC 6981 f.60<sup>v</sup>, ULC 67893 f.26). It is thus apparent that Housman had not read the novel before the twentieth century.

This evidence is not designed to prove that Housman was not widely read in Greek. It is my purpose only to show that there were limits to his knowledge. Such a conclusion cannot be affected by the statement attributed to Wilamowitz, not because I have reason to doubt the truth of the report, but because I do not see how Wilamowitz could prove its truth. And it is in any event notorious that Wilamowitz first learnt of two of Housman's corrections in Sophocles not from the article in which they were published but from A.C.Pearson's edition. I suspect indeed that D.S.Robertson was right to affirm: 'Housman . . . knew far more Greek than most Grecians' (*CR* 50, 1936, p.113). In support of Robertson's position, I may note that Jebb was less widely read in Greek than Housman. In the fifth volume of his *Manilius*, I observe that Housman refers to some 121 different Greek authors: sixty-four of them he cites two or more times, forty-four of them he cites three times or more. Sir Richard Jebb, in the last edition of his *Sophocles' Oedipus Coloneus*, refers to only 109 Greek authors: sixty-five of them two or more times, fifty of them three times or more (*Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part II*, Cambridge 1900, pp.3-295, excluding the apparatus criticus). Since Jebb is commenting on a Greek author and Housman on a Latin writer, I think it is fair to conclude that Housman was more widely read than Jebb. But it will not follow from this statement that Housman knew Greek more widely than any of his British contemporaries. In Headlam's posthumous commentary to the *Agamemnon*, a work far briefer either than Housman's *Manilius* or Jebb's *O.C.*, the writer cites 128 Greek writers: eighty-five two or more times, sixty-one three times or more (*The Agamemnon of Aeschylus* ed. A.C.Pearson, Cambridge 1925, pp.176-262). It is also to be remembered that Housman's *Manilius* appeared when Housman was past seventy years of age; Headlam's *Agamemnon* was essentially the product of a man only in his forties. These statistics lead to the conclusion that Headlam had probably read more widely in Greek than Housman, and therefore, in width of knowledge, was Housman's superior.

Copyright © 1988 P.G.Naiditch

Robin Osborne (Magdalen College, Oxford): *On being a straw man*

LCM13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 144-145

Readers may be under the impression that the Osborne attacked by James Roy in April's *LCM* and the Osborne attacked by Mogens Herman Hansen in the May issue are the same person. This is not the case. The Osborne attacked by Roy is a creature of flesh-and-

blood, who hopes that Roy's contribution will open up further debate on what 'residence' on a piece of land means, and what sort of archaeological signs of residence might be expected. The Osborne attacked by Hansen, however, is a straw man.

Reviewing Hansen's *Demography and Democracy* (1986) the real Osborne drew attention to some gaps in the treatment of the question of how old *bouleutae* were (*JHS* 107 [1987], 233): 'H[ansen]'s argument about the age of *bouleutae* . . . needs more extended development: he does not consider whether his evidence is representative, and does not come entirely clean (but cf. n.183) on the fact that what is important is the age of first service'. Out of this Hansen constructs a straw Osborne who 'questioned my treatment' and 'objects that, in most cases, we do not possess the crucial piece of information: whether a *bouleutés* is serving his first or second term' (*LCM* 13.5 [May 1988], 67). Whereas the real Osborne was pointing to the incompleteness of the treatment, this straw Osborne objects to conclusions.

Similarly, on the question of *bouleutae* serving twice, a comment on what could be drawn from a single set of figures ('H[ansen] gives figures for the *bouleutae* from the tribe Aegeis who are recorded for the year 343/2 and says that they suggest 'at least a fifth' of *bouleutae* may have served twice. In fact those figures suggest that at least 60% of *bouleutae* may have served twice' [*JHS* 107 (1987), 233]) is turned into 'Another disagreement between Osborne and myself' concerning 'the proportion of councillors who served twice'. The real Osborne was pointing to the inference allowed by the information known about councillors of the tribe Aegeis; the straw Osborne has hypotheses about the proportion of councillors overall who served twice. Once more a comment on the argument is turned into a belief in a different conclusion.

The straw Osborne has also made an appearance (alongside a rather more palpable figure) in Hansen's *Three Studies in Athenian Demography* (1988). Here a figure put up as 'a minimum figure which must have been already reached by the late sixth century and must have been maintained thereafter (it is not unlikely that it was considerably exceeded)' (*Demos. The discovery of classical Attika* [Cambridge 1985], 43) is criticised (p.6 n.118) for ignoring the fact that by the middle of the 4th century some demes had more than enough citizens to fill their bouleutic quotas. Then (8-9) a note suggesting that it would be wrong to *rule out* an annual growth rate of more than 1% at least over the short term (*Demos* 225 n.91) is taken to imply belief in an actual growth rate of 1% over the long term. Finally, a real Osborne who wrote that 'The Classical city which had the most regular need for grain from outside was undoubtedly Athens', that 'by ancient Greek standards, Athens had an exceptional need for imported corn', and that 'Athenian demand for corn was not typical, Athens was abnormally heavily populated' (*Classical Landscape with figures. The ancient Greek city and its countryside* [London 1987], 97, 99) is turned by Hansen into a straw Osborne who 'seems to forget that classical Athens was the exception and not the rule' (p.13).

The flesh-and-blood Osborne is happy to be attacked and proved wrong, but he would like to be allowed to question arguments as well as conclusions, and he resents the creation of a straw Osborne competing for the limelight.

Copyright © 1988 Robin Osborne

David Whitehead (Manchester): *Athenians in Xenophon's Hellenica*

*LCM* 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 145-147

'The solitary instance of a demotic in Xenophon occurs not in the *Hellenica* but, amidst single names, at *Memorabilia* 2.7.6; and the demes themselves play the most minor of roles in a narrative to which they had little to contribute' (D.Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 B.C.: a political and social study* [Princeton 1986], 48).

'Up to a point, Lord Copper'. With an alacrity surpassed only by his restraint Simon Hornblower has exposed the error here: 'Xen. *Hell.* (i 4; v 1) distinguishes the Thrasybuloi by

demotics . . . Whitehead (p.48) curiously says that Xen. *Hell.* has no demotics [v. sup.] and cites only *Mem.ii.7.6'* (S.Hornblower, *Thucydides* [London 1987], 97 n.98). Something is amiss, to be sure, with Dr Hornblower's references – read 4.8.25 and 5.1.26 for 'i 4; v 1' – but no matter: the plain truth is that I should have read the *Hellenica* less carelessly, so as to frame my point about the marginality of the Attic demes in Xenophon (as in his exemplar Thucydides) in terms properly less categorical but more accurate.

For – and herein lies my only aim and justification in responding – I would indeed wish to claim that in essence the point retains its validity; that, taken together, 4.8.25 and 5.1.26 exemplify that much-abused but (on occasions like this) irresistible notion, the exception that proves the rule. Here that 'rule' is quite simply the fact that whenever Xenophon wished to designate individual Athenians with anything beyond their single names he did not naturally think to employ the names of their demes.

As the necessary context for this observation it must first be understood that such extra designations of *any kind at all* are very few (if not always, as it happens, far between) in the *Hellenica*. Give or take a few instances of possible homonymity, some 395 historical persons are named (one third of them Athenians, another third Spartans; and in fewer than 8% of cases does Xenophon bother – the word seems unavoidable – to identify them more precisely than by single *nomina*. Where he does, for whatever reason, do so, a variety of means are deployed: notice, by way of example, the Spartan Lakrates *ὁ ὀλυμπιονίκης* (2.4.33) and the Arcadian Antiochos *ὁ παγκρατιαστής* (7.1.33). But the patronymic is favourite. On the usual assumption that 2.2.24 (with Dionysios *ὁ Ἑρμοκράτους*) is interpolated, and accepting Leonclavius' *Στρομβιχίδου* for *Στρομβιχίδης* in 6.3.2, we find that Xenophon gives nineteen men their patronymic, two of them twice over; and from the fact that eleven of the nineteen appear in Book 1 it emerges plainly enough that even this minimal degree of prosopographical precision falls away as the work unfolds.

Another noteworthy subset of the nineteen individuals identified by patronymic is the ten of them who are Athenians (the others are five Syracusans, two Spartans, a Rhodian and a Phleiasian). That proportion in itself prompts a suspicion that supplementary designations of all kinds are more likely to be given to Athenians than to others; and so indeed it proves. Thus, in addition to Euryptolemos *Πεισιάνακτος* and the other nine men with patronymics we encounter the likes of: Alkibiades *Ἀλκιβιάδου ἀνεψιὸς καὶ συμφύγας* (1.2.13); Kallistratos *φυλῆς Λεοντίδος* (2.4.27); another, more prominent Kallistratos, twice called *ὁ δημογόρος* (6.2.39, 6.3.3); Kleokritos *ὁ τῶν μυστῶν κῆρυξ* (2.4.20); Leon *ὁ Σαλαμίνιος* (2.3.39); Nikostratos *ὁ καλὸς ἐπικαλούμενος* (2.4.6) and of course the two Thrasybouloi.

Why the supplementary designations in these cases but not in so many others? Given their decidedly heterogenous character, the question may well not admit of a single, simple answer. 6.3.2. is manifestly an oddity, even if its exact nature remains obscure: see D.J.Mosley, *PCPhS* ns8 (1962), 41-46; C.J.Tuplin, *LCM* 2.3 (Mar.1977), 51-56. The only generalization which it seems prudent to make is a negative one: that Xenophon took no *systematic* care, either with Athenians or in general, to distinguish between *homonyms* in his narrative by providing them with patronymics or other marks of additional identification. If he felt – as presumably he did – that his readers could safely be relied upon not to confuse or conflate Timokrates the Athenian (1.7.3), Timokrates the Rhodian (3.5.1), Timokrates the Spartan (7.1.13) and Timokrates the Syracusan (7.4.12), nobody could justly censure him for that. But what of the Athenian, or Athenians, called Leon? Common sense will suggest that Leon the general of 406/5 (1.5.6, 1.6.16) is unlikely to be identical with Leon the ambassador to Persian in 367 (7.1.33 and 38). But scholars legitimately differ on the question of whether the first of these and Leon *ὁ Σαλαμίνιος* are or are not one and the same: see for instance A.Andrewes and D.M.Lewis, *JHS* 77 (1957), 179. As regards the two Kallistratoi, only someone failing to notice that one of them died in Book 2 would be in any danger of supposing him identical with Kallistratos 'the public speaker' in Book 6. The latter, one must suppose, is so called simply because that is what he was (and despite the fact that



Xenophon passes over, without comparable comment, many others of equal celebrity); while the former was one of Xenophon's comrades in the cavalry corps – a body of men whose prominence in his narrative of the events of 404-3 is commonly remarked upon, and whose casualties then it will have been natural for him to record with touches, as appropriate, of (?) affection (Nikostratos ὁ καλὸς ἐπικαλούμενος) or military pride (Kallistratos φυλῆς Λεοντίδος).

These equestrian examples tend in fact to suggest that the likeliest explanation for Xenophon's throwing in a patronymic *vel sim.* may often be nothing more or less than personal acquaintance with the individual himself, but sometimes, more obliquely, with an unmentioned homonym. It is *prima facie* odd, for instance, that the first of the two generals in 1.4.21 is plain Aristokrates and the second Adeimantos ὁ Λευκοφίδου; but then one realizes (with Underhill's help) that Xenophon was almost certainly seeking here to obviate any confusion with Adeimantos the son of Ariston, Plato's brother. Note also, for this circle, Charmides ὁ Γλαύκωνος (2.4.19) and of course Sokrates ὁ Σωφρονίσκου (1.7.15). Euryptolemos Πεισιδνακτος (1.4.19, 1.7.12) was another personal friend; and – outside Athens – the Agesilaos connection is evident with οἱ ἀμφὶ Προκλέα τὸν Ἴππονίκου in Phleious (5.3.13). On Kallias Ἴππονίκου there are perceptive remarks in Tuplin, *op. cit.* 55.

What then of the two Thrasybouloi? Underhill's note on 4.8.25 (Θρασύβουλον τὸν Στειριέα) would seem to make one point plainly enough: 'the name of his deme is here for the first time added to distinguish him from Thrasybulus ὁ Κολλυτεύς mentioned in 5.1.26'. In other words, throughout Books 1 and 2, and as late as 3.5.126, Xenophon has been perfectly happy to call the Steirian plain Thrasyboulos, as the only person of that name in the narrative – a state of affairs attained, of course, by ignoring Thrasyboulos the Kollytan's part in events before 390 (and *imprimis*, in 1.5.16, his impeachment of Alkibiades after Notion: Plut. *Alk.* 36.1). Yet the Kollytan's subliminal presence in the narrative, by the latter stages of Book 4, has apparently become strong enough to require the 'Thrasyboulos' who appears in 4.8.25 – i.e. fully forty chapters before he himself does – to be identified as someone different. Thucydides offered a precedent, of one were needed, for giving Thrasyboulos of Steiria his patronymic, Λύκου (Thuc. 8.75.2). Xenophon, for the first and only time in *Hellenica*, preferred demotics: Στειριεύς in 4.8.25, Κολλυτεύς (cf. *Mem.* 2.7.6!) in 5.1.26. I wish I could fathom why. Could it be – as not only *Mem.* 2.7.6 but also (e.g.) Lysias 16.15 (τοῦ σεμνοῦ Στειριῶς) might suggest – that an explanation lies not so much in Xenophon's own usage as in the habits and preferences of one or both of the individuals themselves?

Copyright © 1988 David Whitehead

Niall W. Slater (Center for Hellenic Studies) *The Date of Euripides' Oineus*

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 147-148

The only evidence for the date of Euripides' *Oineus* is in Euripides' question to Dicaeopolis at *Acharnians* 418-19:

τὰ ποῖα τρύχη; μῶν ἐν οἷς Οἰνεὺς ὄδῃ  
ὁ δύσποτμος γεραιὸς ἡγωνίζετο;

This gives us a terminus ante quem of 425, the date of the *Acharnians*. I suggest there is a terminus post quem as well implied in ἡγωνίζετο.

In Aristophanes the verb does not mean simply 'perform, play one's part', as Sommerstein (Warminster 1980), Rennie (London 1909), and Mueller (Hanover 1863) take it, but rather 'engage in a contest'. The verb can be used of the poet competing at the festival: so of Theognis at *Acharnians* 140. The reference to Thespis in *Wasps* 1479 is less clear: Thespis both composed and performed. Note, though, that while Thespis' activity is described as ἡγωνίζετο, Philocleon's intent to outdo tragic performers is not — for that is not a formal contest. The verb can be used of competition in the lawcourts or before the *boulé* (*Wasps* 993, *Knights* 614), or it can be a self-conscious reference to the agon of the comedy itself

(*Acharnians* 481, *Knights* 687). Used of Oineus himself here, it is rather curious. Nothing in the myth suggests Oineus himself engaged in an agon within the play; indeed a formal contest in tragedy might seem dangerously metatheatrical. Nor does 'Oineus' here stand for the whole play (as Starkie thought, hence his stage direction for Euripides 'taking up a [book] roll'). The demonstrative *ὅδι* does suggest a gesture, but to the costume or perhaps, as the scholiast thought (*ὡς προκειμένου του προσώπου Οἰνέως*), the mask. In what sense then could the individual character of Oineus compete? Only, I submit, in the actors' contests among the protagonists. These were instituted at the City Dionysia around 449 and at the Lenaia perhaps 440-430. Thus in the absence of any indication of whether Oineus was a City or Lenaeian play, we have a terminus post quem of 449 – not a marked improvement, given that Euripides' career began in 455.

My colleague Jeffrey Henderson has suggested that Euripides (unlike other tragic poets, apparently) used *ἀγωνίζεσθαι* for a range of character actions within his plays so that Aristophanes may here be poking fun at Euripides' tendency to use such 'prose' words as this in his plays. Euripides' use of the verb, however, seems to me to pay close attention to the agon in question. Its legal use (*Andromeda* 336, *Hippolytus* 1023) can be extended to supplication (*Heracles* 155). It can be used of physical combat, whether in war (*Heracleidae* 795, 992; *Suppliants* 637, 685) or between individuals (*Heracleidae* 653, *Helen* 843). The combat with death in *Alcestis* (648, *καίτοι καλόν γ' ἂν τόνδε ἀγῶν ἡγωνίσω*) eventually becomes physical combat as well. So too is Creusa's struggle against Apollo's rape (*Ion* 939). Bandyng words with a herald (*Suppliants* 427, 465) falls somewhere between these two uses. In all of these instances the nature of the agon and the combatants is clear. Only in the late and highly metatheatrical *Orestes* is the verb used in the sense of 'act, play our parts': *Orestes* 1124, *ἐπειτ' ἀγῶνα πῶς ἀγωνιούμεθα*.

Thus in 425 we have no reason to believe either Aristophanes or Euripides would use the word so metaphorically that the agon in question would be unclear. The agon at *Acharnians* 419 must either be that of the poets or the actors. Here a passage in *Thesmophoriazousae* is helpful. Echo (played by Euripides) says that she competed along with Euripides (1061, *ξυνηγωνιζόμενῃ*) at the festival last year. In other words she aided Euripides in his struggle (agon) for the poet's prize. By Aristophanes' usage, if the character of Euripides at *Acharnians* 418-19 means the poets' contest, he should speak of it in the first person. His third person usage can only imply the character's competition as an actor – which is perfectly in keeping with the self-conscious discussion of tragic performance in which Dicaeopolis and Euripides are engaged. It is tempting to speculate that whoever played Oineus may have been more memorable than the play as a whole, and so his portrayal is thus memorialized; we know, for example, of a winning actor in 418 who played in a losing play. Certainly the institution of the actors' contests demonstrates the growing importance of their contribution to the overall success of the play. If we assume that Aristophanes chose his words carefully, that change is reflected here, and the date of the *Oineus* must fall after the introduction of the tragic actors' competitions at Athens.

Copyright © 1988 Niall W. Slater

Review: **Brian Arkins** (Galway)

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 148-151

John Ferguson, *Catullus*, Greece & Rome. New Surveys in the Classics No.20, published for the Classical Association, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988. Pp.viii + 50, paper, £2.50. ISSN 0017-3835.

Catullus is the twentieth topic in this very useful series, and Ferguson has provided a concise (50 pages) and valuable account of recent work on the poet, whom a previous author in the series, E.J.Kenney, provocatively designated, together with Lucretius, as 'the two most powerful and original Latin poets of all time' (*Lucretius* [Oxford 1977], 3).

I follow the order of topics dealing with Catullus (hereafter C.) as set out by Ferguson (hereafter F.).

*Introduction* F. rightly regards Fordyce's edition as 'a great disappointment' (2) because of its omission of 32 poems, regarded as sexually explicit. This procedure was attacked by E. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 34 (1962), 253-4, and Quinn's edition was attacked on similar grounds by L. C. Curran, *AJPh* 96 (1975), 312-14.

F. is right to praise Quinn's literary criticism of C., which has helped considerably to focus attention on the poems themselves. While Quinn's view that the critic's task is to reconstruct the hypothesis of the poem is unexceptionable, the further view that a poem by C. is 'about some one thing' is much more debatable, and certainly does not apply to poems like 64 and 68b.

*Text* Mention should be made of the Paduan pre-humanist Lovato Lovati (1241-1309), who knew Catullus (L. D. Reynolds & N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* [1974<sup>2</sup>], 110-111).

F. quotes G. D. Goold's claim that his text is 'truer to Catullus' words than any ever yet printed'. The recent controversy about the supposedly definitive text of Joyce's *Ulysses* is sufficient to make claims of this kind suspect. At Poem 1.9-10 Goold prints *qualecumque quidem patroni ut ergo | plus uno maneat perenne saeclo* and so introduces the spurious notion that C. was the *cliens* of Cornelius Nepos, for which there is not a shred of evidence (B. Arkins, *LCM* 8.2 [Feb. 1983], 18-20, replying to G. P. Goold, *LCM* 6.9 [Nov. 1981], 233-8).

*Life of Catullus* We know very little about C.'s life and do very well to be very cautious (T. P. Wiseman, *JRS* 69 [1979], 161-8).

While all the poems mentioning Caelius and Rufus cannot refer to Marcus Caelius Rufus, who came from Interamnium in Picenum (R. G. Austin's edition of Cicero, *pro Caelio* [Oxford 1960], 146-7), since the Caelius of Poem 100 (probably the same as the Caelius of Poem 58) came from Verona. But the Rufus of poem 77, who is attacked for stealing Lesbia from C., can most plausibly be identified with Marcus Caelius Rufus, and this is a cogent consideration in identifying Lesbia with Clodia Metelli, who had an affair with Caelius Rufus (B. Arkins, *Phil.* 127 [1983], 306-11).

*Did Catullus edit his own book?* We know that about 35 B.C. Horace published his first collection of *Sermones* in book form; the question is whether he was anticipated in that practice about 20 years earlier by Catullus. Given the enormous impact of Callimachus upon Latin poetry (a book to elaborate on W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rome* [Wiesbaden 1960] is now a desideratum) and that Callimachus arranged his own works, given further the crucial references to Callimachus in the first (1) and last (116) of C.'s poems and that there are obvious groupings of poems in the collection (e.g. 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11), there is a very great probability that C. arranged his own work and F. is entirely correct to stress this (cf. B. Arkins, *Latomus* 46 [1987], 847-8).

*Literary Inheritance* F. is a little too generous to the account of C.'s Roman background given by Quinn (*The Catullan Revolution* [Cambridge 1969<sup>2</sup>], 1-18), when he himself describes his omission of the Alexandrian background as 'almost perverse' (17). It is not that C. is not original – I have argued at length in this journal that he is (*LCM* 3.3 [Mar. 1978], 65-9) – but the proper place to begin investigation of Latin poetry is with Greek literature and, above all, with Callimachus, who is obviously perceived as a *liberating influence* – as F. clearly sees. What Callimachus offered Latin poets was a doctrine about poetry – championing brevity, innovation, learning, technical skill – which was very attractive and simultaneously allowed the major Latin poets to develop in their own way. In C.'s case this meant the love poems to Lesbia, for which there is no Greek precedent (B. Arkins, *Latomus* 47 [1988], 285-93).

Much confusion surrounds the question of whether or not C. was part of a 'school' of poets. F. appears to treat sympathetically the claims of Valerius Cato to be the focus of such a school, but these claims are highly problematical (N. B. Crowther, *CPh* 66 [1971], 108-9). Much more interesting is Cicero's reference to *cantores Euphorionis* since Euphorion subscribed to the Callimachean literary doctrine and since traces of Euphorion's influence have been

found in C. (B.Arkins, *LCM* 4 9 [Nov. 1979], 199-202; C.J.Tuplin, *CQ* ns31 [1981], 113-39). But, at the same time, the existence of *cantores Euphorionis* does not provide evidence for a closely knit 'school' of poets, but only for a general tendency; an analogy in modern times would be the poets of the Thirties in Britain—Auden, Isherwood, Spender, Macneice—who shared certain tendencies, but each of whom was also quite distinctive.

*Catullus and his Weltanschauung* F. asserts that it is 'undoubtedly true that Catullus was politically concerned' (21). This statement may be allowed only if it is taken to refer not to the nitty-gritty of political life in the Late Republic, but to the *mores*, and especially the sexual *mores* of society. For C. often attacks what Quinn calls 'the sick society', to which he opposes his own individual integrity (D.Konstan, *Catullus' Indictment of Rome: the Meaning of Catullus 64* [Amsterdam 1977]; B.Arkins, *Sexuality in Catullus* (Hildesheim 1982), 34-45). Indeed what we have in the poems is very much the individual person Gaius Valerius Catullus reacting to the world and its denizens as they impinge upon him; and it is the power of this highly personalized reaction that constitutes a large part of C.'s attraction.

*The Lesbia Poems* F. is too kind to the idea that *passer* in Poems 2 and 3 may be a euphemism for *mentula* (against this: H.D.Jocelyn, *AJPh* 101 [1980], 421-41). and too eager to turn poem 7, a poem essentially of metaphysical wit, into 'a dark poem' (B.Arkins, *Ant Class* 48 [1979], 630-35). F. does not bring out clearly that Poem 8 is a poem of *ambivalence*, in which C. realises intellectually that Lesbia has betrayed him, but is still emotionally incapable of freeing himself from her.

If the controversial *otium*-stanza of Poem 51 belongs to that poem, there is a great deal to be said for the view that *otium* here means 'lack of enterprise in love' (R.J.Baker, *RhM* 124 [1981], 312-34). On the other hand, if Horace followed his usual procedure in regard to 'mottoes' at *Carm.* 2.16.1-8, then the *otium*-stanza constitutes the beginning of a new poem (J.A.Richmond, *RhM* 113 [1970], 197-204).

F. does not clarify that at Poem 58.5 *glubit*, means that Lesbia masturbates the men (B.Arkins, *LCM* 4.5 [May 1979], 85-6) and his reading *magnanimi* there should be replaced by *magnanimos* (B.Arkins, *LCM* 2.10 [Dec.1977], 237-8; O.Skutsch, *LCM* 5.1 [Jan.1980], 21).

*The Polymetrics* I have very little to add to F.'s perceptive analyses here.

At Poem 29.24 read *urbis opulentissime*; i.e. Crassus (J.D.Minyard, *CPh* 66 [1971], 174-81; C.Dérout, *RBPh* 55 [1977], 56-78).

Poem 45 is surely a poem of happy love, though detached and witty (Arkings, *Sexuality*, 20-21).

F. has useful remarks on Poem 61, but the Manlius Torquatus of that poem cannot be identified with the Allius of Poem 68.67.

F. is unduly negative about the genre we now call *epyllion*. For not only is there an appropriate Greek analogue for C.64, Callimachus' *Hecale*, but C.'s fellow-poets wrote *epyllia*: Calvus an *Io*, Cinna a *Zmyrna*, and Cornificius a *Glaucus*. F. sidesteps the point that in Poem 64 the two major themes—the essentially happy marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and the essentially unhappy love affair between Ariadne and Thetis—contrast with one another (G.Ramain, *RPh* 46 [1922], 151).

*The Elegiac Poems* F. rightly says of Poem 65 that 'the glory of the poem is its final image', but fails to mention that the image of the girl with the love apple not only continues the theme of marriage begun in Poem 61 and pursued till 68b (G.Lieberg, *RFIC* 36 [1958], 23-47), but also ends the poem—which introduces 66, a translation of Callimachus—with a reference to the myth of Acontius and Cydippe in the *Aitia* (L.W.Daly, *CPh* 47 [1952], 97-9; W.Clausen, *HSCPh* 74 [1970], 93).

Stress should be laid on the role of Poem 68b in the development of Latin love elegy (G.Solmsen in *Monumentum Chiloniense*, ed. E.Lefèvre [Amsterdam 1975], 260-76).

In Poem 93 reference should be made to the possibility that *albus an ater* may reflect indifference to Caesar's sexual proclivities (V.Ingemann, *C&M* 33 [1981-2], 145-50).

*Translations* F. rightly says that no contemporary translation is definitive, but one

important point must be made in these days of Classical Civilization programmes, where translations must be used: the Penguin of Whigham is a *version*, not a translation, and is very inaccurate. It is sufficient to note that *vivamus, me Lesbia, atque amemus* is erroneously rendered as 'Lesbia I live with me I and love me'. A much better, closer translation is that of James Michie (the disappearance of whose bilingual translation of the *Odes* of Horace from Penguin must be regretted). For a defence of the curious 'translation' by Louis and Celia Zukovsky (referred to, but not named by F.) see D.M.Hooley, *Sagentrieb* 5 (1986), 107-23.

*Influence* F. summarizes his many articles on C. and other Latin poets, and is very good on the Renaissance period.

Modern poets not mentioned are Frost, Pound and Yeats. But Frost had his copy of Catullus 'oftentimes bedside' and was much taken with the theme of *odi et amo* (M.J.C.Putnam, *TAPhA* 113 [1983], 243-62). Pound held that 'the Greeks might be hard put to it to find a better poet among themselves than is their disciple Catullus' (*Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, ed. T.S.Eliot [London 1960, 240] and it is interesting to note that Pound, whose *Selected Poems* Eliot termed 'a text-book of modern versification' (*Ezra Pound, Selected Essays*, ed. T.S.Eliot [London 1967], 7), adverted to C.'s metrical virtuosity: 'I prize the Greek more for the movement of the words, rhythm, perhaps than for anything else. There is the *Poikilothron* (Sappho fr.1) and then Catullus *Collis O Heliconii* (Poem 61) and some Propertius, that one could do worse than know by heart for the sake of knowing what rhythm really is' (*The Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941*, ed. D.D.Paige [London 1951], 143).

Yeats, writing of Arthur Symons' translations of C., of which Pound wrote 'we can but wonder if any man, in English, has better succeeded in finding the tone and idiom to render him or his poetry' ('Arthur Symons', reprinted in *Agenda* 17-18 [1979-80], 57), asserted 'nor shall I ever know how much my practice and theory owes to the passages he read me from Catullus and from Verlaine and Mallarmé' (*Autobiographies* [London 1980], 319-20; for Yeats and C. see J.J.O'Meara, *University Rev.* 3.8 [1966], 15-24; id., *Terres Celtiques, école d'été de Dublin* 13, 43-57).

Finally mention should be made of another recent survey of C.: J.Granarolo, 'Catulle 1960-1985', *Lustrum* 28-9 (1986-7), 65-106, and of an issue of the journal *Classical World* 81.5 (1988) devoted to C. and containing articles by M.B.Skinner, J.D.Minyard, A.Richlin, D.A.Traill, W., Dettmer, J.K.King and J.C.Hallett.

Copyright © 1988 Brian Arkins

Review: W.Geoffrey Arnot (Leeds)

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov/Dec 1988), 151-155

G.O.Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988. Pp.xii + 374. Cloth, £40. ISBN 0-19-81 4040-1

Dr Hutchinson's first major work – an edition of Aeschylus' *Septem contra Thebas* with commentary (Oxford 1985) – won an immediate welcome as 'a good and thoroughly reliable edition' (A.P.Garvie, *CR* ns36 (1986), 191f.) founded on a precise and sensitive understanding of the Greek language. Its qualities made one look forward all the more eagerly to his next project, a large-scale study of Hellenistic poetry, where that particular sensitivity to nuances of meaning, tone and intention was a prime desideratum. The new book, however, is curiously disappointing. Although H(utchinson)'s talents have enabled him to illuminate *en passant* many a detail of interpretation in the passages he discusses, his attempts to identify the individual qualities of his poets too often fail to satisfy, for reasons which will emerge in the course of this review.

In his preface H. announces that 'this book attempts a literary account of the principal poets working between c.280 B.C. and c.240 B.C., and also discusses their impact on Roman poetry'. Laudable aims indeed: but the question immediately arises, why is the chronological



period so restricted? Admittedly in the second volume of the great work whose title, structure and subject arrangement H. so ambitiously emulates, Wilamowitz's *Hellenistische Dichtung* (Berlin 1924), the area of study is limited to the poets of Callimachus' time; even so, as Rudolph Kassel has recently reminded us in a fine lecture to the Mommsengesellschaft (*Die Abgrenzung des Hellenismus in der griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin and New York 1987), the period of literary creativity extended far beyond these limits, and the exclusion of writers such as Moschus, Bion and Meleager from H.'s survey is greatly to be regretted.

H.'s book devotes separate chapters to Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes, Theocritus, a quartet of other poets (Aratus, Herodas, Lycophron, Asclepiades), and finally the relationship between Hellenistic and Roman poetry. Before these H. writes a provocative introduction which opens with three surprising claims: that the celebrated Hellenistic poets 'have not received much literary treatment', that they are seldom 'read with much enjoyment or understanding', and that modern readers prefer their poetry to be 'essentially straightforward'. Equally dogmatic and unargued judgements follow: in modern scholarship Hellenistic poetry is sometimes misunderstood because of a 'swollen conception' of the part played in it by learning, literary theory and feelings of nostalgia in an urbanised Alexandria for the countryside and the classical past. H.'s scepticism is perhaps most beneficial when it illuminates the attitude of Hellenistic poetry to religion, the influence of contemporary art, or the difficulty of determining the spread and erudition of the readership. He wisely chooses to investigate his poets against their political background and literary inheritance, but derives the main effects of their poetry from a 'piquant combination' of, and 'delicate hovering' between, the grand and the less grand, the serious and the unserious, while he goes on to identify further characteristic elements there as 'the sordid, the bizarre, the handling of the self, complication through form'. H.'s introduction contains much that has been said before, much that by its provocative expression requires the reader to re-examine traditional views, and he is always precise and instructive on the meaning of disputed or misconstrued passages of Greek.

Despite this, the introduction as a whole satisfies me no more than the rest of the book. Style and presentation are at times opaque, and too often – notably in confrontational footnotes – assertion replaces argument. Throughout the work H.'s analyses affect a restricted critical vocabulary which stresses ideas like complexity, distancing, disruption, paradox and subversion; favours adjectives such as bizarre, delicious and weird; and thus tends to irritate by a repetitive preciousness even where it illuminates. With his concentration on structure and tonal values H. falls into two traps. The reiterated emphasis on that piquant juxtaposition of high seriousness and low unseriousness in Hellenistic poetry deceives readers into thinking that what is distinctive must also be unique; yet such juxtapositions were always a common feature in other periods and genres (e.g. Ar. *Ran.* 1331ff.). Secondly H. either chooses, or is compelled, to give less weight than their due to other characteristic features in Hellenistic poetry: descriptive vividness, presentation of character, word-play, for instance. H. is not always immune to a tendency to misrepresent the views of those who emphasise aspects of which he disapproves. Thus in damning the allegedly misleading view of Callimachus and his allies as a small island in a vast sea of post-classical literature, he distorts the case argued by K. Ziegler in *Das hellenistische Epos* (2nd edition, Leipzig 1966) that in Callimachus' time long epics were a dominant, not a vanquished, genre; and in maintaining that *die Kreuzung der Gattungen* is less prominent in Hellenistic poetry than recent critics have suggested, he assesses the evidence less convincingly than his opponents (e.g. G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry*, London etc. 1987). In sum, H.'s book seems to me to give an incomplete and distorted view of its subject.

H. begins his study of Callimachus by rejecting the 'general conception' (already exploded by Bulloch's brilliant discussion in *CHCL* I.549ff.) of the poet as a 'frivolous pedant' uninterested in serious human emotion. H. examines Callimachus' use of erudition,

sometimes as part of the witty tone (hymn 6.45f.), character presentation (fr.178 Pfeiffer), or ironic comment, distancing the poet from his subject. H. rightly notes the amount of 'disruption' and 'paradox' in the poet's use of narrative or in emotional representation, leading to a treatment that is rarely straightforward. H. is at his best on interpretative details (e.g. hymns 4.127ff., 5.85ff., 6.45f.; Heracles and Molochus in the *Aetia*; fr. 194; epigrams 37 and 42 Gow-Page), and in highlighting Callimachus' use of form and tone. Yet most of H.'s analyses amount to little more than descriptive summary couched in his overworked critical vocabulary, and his stress on certain aspects of the poet (structure; relation to his subject and to the reader; exploitation of genre, religion and scholarship) at the expense of others which H. rejects (e.g. Callimachus' choice and arrangement of words) leads to only a partial and limited picture of the poet, as if a mosaic portrait had been constructed from an idiosyncratic selection of the available tesserae. This incompleteness inevitably makes one all the more wary of some of H.'s most provocative judgements, such as his inclination to dismiss the generally accepted belief that Callimachus had a positive literary programme condemning contemporary imitators of Homer.

The chapter on Apollonius of Rhodes also begins confrontationally with attacks on 'suppositions' about this poet's historical and literary background, most of which (e.g. the notion that epic was then a rejected form, cf. Ziegler; or that Callimachus and Apollonius quarrelled, cf. Bulloch *CHCL* I.586f.) are now generally discarded, but H.'s strongest polemic is directed against the interpretation of Jason in the *Argonautica* as an anti-hero. H.'s counter-portrayal of Jason as an Homeric type of hero seems to be based on an unrepresentative selection of isolated references (e.g. 2.122) and an unconvincing comparison with Agamemnon in the *Iliad*. Indeed H. undercuts his own case when he goes on to stress the contrast in the third book of the *Argonautica* between Peleus' traditional heroic attitudes and those of Jason.

H.'s attempt to argue for a unity of design in the poem seems to me a parallel failure. After defending the intrusion of aetiological digressions by the allegation that they have an important structural function distancing us from the story and disjoining the narrative, H. seeks to explain the *Argonautica*'s unity in an unexpected way: by attacking critics who demand only an Aristotelian unity of action and plot, and seeing in the poem a 'basic, loose unity' of action which serves as framework for more complicated types of unity and disunity. But how loose and disunited can unity be? H. here seems guilty of self-contradiction, especially when he highlights the discontinuity of the narrative in books 1 and 2, and the 'disruptive' series of episodes in 4.

Yet despite the disappointments over H.'s analysis of the poem as a whole, with its stress on structure and 'large movements', there are excellent and insightful comments on individual passages (e.g. 3.458, 4.191ff., 920ff.; Apollonius' use of *θέμις* and *ἥρωες*; the conflict in Medea between love and family loyalty; the reversal of the *νόστος* theme in the experience of Medea), although the interpretations of 2.686ff. (where I see no trace of parody in Orpheus' prayer) and 4.1699ff. appear unconvincing.

H.'s discussion of Theocritus opens by stressing the poet's affinities with Callimachus and Apollonius. Here the negative points (e.g. the lack of evidence for any 'pastoral collection' made by Theocritus) seem better than the positive ones. By singling out such features as the deliberate effects of 'jarring or piquant juxtaposition' (which indeed are important in idylls 5 and 22), concentrating once more on form, tonal contrast and 'the different levels of narrative and emotion in each poem', and claiming that the central aim of Theocritus is 'to place the beautiful and the passionate in opposition to the grotesque, the unattractive and the low', H. produces an incomplete and somewhat distorted picture of the idylls, with many aspects of the poet's work neglected, dismissed or underplayed. Robert Wells' survey of the poet's work in the introduction to his recent translation of Theocritus (Manchester and New York 1988) seems far better balanced and more sensitive. Of course H. makes some good comments (e.g. on the interweaving of the different voices and levels in 6, on the contrast between the relationships of Aphrodite with Adonis and of Gorgo and Praxinoa

with their two men in 15) and interprets the Greek of individual passages with freshness and skill (e.g. 1.16ff., 2.124, 11.76, 22.115), although at times his interpretations may be challenged (e.g. in 2, when he assumes that Simaetha is mistaken in her belief that Hecate is appearing, he comes close to a documentary fallacy).

H. closes his analysis of Theocritus with a full discussion of idyll 7, starting from the 'programmatically' verses 43-48. To these H. denies any external significance outside its particular dramatic context, and claims that here Lycidas is merely praising Simichidas' modesty. It is useful to have these lines properly related to their context, but H.'s assumption that because the verses can be understood with complete satisfaction in the closed dramatic situation, any secondary and co-existent interpretation of them as a proclamation of support for the Callimachean approach to poetry is automatically ruled out, betrays an attitude on H.'s part to poetic intentions that is at once naively simplistic and almost certainly fallacious.

H. rightly doubts the identification of Simichidas in the poem as the poet Theocritus himself, drawing attention to the scholia on 21a., which point to the use of the name Simichidas by a local Coan family; but he rejects less convincingly the theory that the encounter between Simichidas and Lycidas parodies a ceremony of poetic initiation. Here he fails to note or discuss any of the numerous details in the poem (cf. *Estudios Clasicos* 87 [1984], 388ff.) which lend support to the theory. H. is at his best in observing the different levels of reality in the poem,, but although several interesting comments on isolated details emerge *en passant* (e.g. on 154, where he follows A. Barigazzi without any acknowledgement, *SIFC* 41 [1961], 5ff.) one's final impression is that H.'s account of this idyll is less felicitous than many which have appeared since Gow's edition of the poet.

H.'s fifth chapter tackles four other poets of the age – Aratus, Herodas, Lycophron and Asclepiades. The section on Aratus' *Phaenomena* overrates the poem ('his superb creation', H. calls it). H. draws attention to the 'bizarre disharmony' of treating constellations at one and the same time as stars and as mythical figures, and he is (as always) excellent on details of meaning (e.g. *εἰσωπός* 184), while the emphasis on 'differing tones and levels, strangely and strikingly juxtaposed' seems more illuminating in the analysis of this second-rate writer.

The treatment of Herodas begins with a claim that the mimiambes were not written for dramatic performance. H. may well be right here, but his arguments are less substantial than those advanced by G. Mastromarco (*The Public of Herondas*, Amsterdam 1984) to sustain the opposing case. H. writes sensibly on some individual points (e.g. the presentation of Battarus in 2), but his general approach seems unsatisfactory and incomplete. Claiming that his analysis of language and tonal values does more justice to his author than 'a narrow concentration on the drawing of individuals', he forgets that both are needed, along with an awareness of the contrast between the dialectal oddities and the everyday vulgarity of subject, and of Herodas' ability to focus on a vividly portrayed significant detail, for a fully rounded appraisal of these strange works.

After a brief section of Lycophron, which recognises this author's faults, H. discusses the epigrams of Asclepiades. Here he stresses the poet's use of imagery, concentration on extremes of emotion, changes of tone, and brevity, but he virtually ignores the wit and clever word-play.

The final chapter (as in Wilamowitz's second volume, deals with the relationship between Hellenistic and Roman poetry. Once again H. argues that form and tone played a larger role than alleged literary theories, but neither the reasoning nor the conclusions convince. He examines a selection of Roman works in some detail (especially Catullus 61-68, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 8), but the insistent emphasis on form and tone makes him less appreciative of other possible types of connection (e.g. Theocritus 2.103ff. and Catullus 68b.70ff.). In conclusion H. claims that the influence of Hellenistic poetry on Rome in the first century B.C. was most obvious in the 'impulse to complicate the straightforward and the emotional', in the exploitation of structure, and in the desire to produce violent contrasts and

conflicts of tone. This is clearly one series of areas where the influence is visible, but are they the most significant ones? Not everyone will think so.

H. adds a brief bibliography to help his readers study further the authors picked out in his book. It is sensibly selective and evaluative; Zanker's monograph and Cunningham's new Teubner edition of Herodas (Berlin 1987) need now to be added. There are perhaps more misprints than one would expect from the Clarendon Press; the most troublesome appear to be the reference to 'p.000' at p.46 n.41; the quotation of Apollonius 4.1169 at p.134 (read  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$ ). I conclude with a few details. 28 n.6: cf. *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982), 306 n.42. 76 n.100: cf. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955), 12ff., on Sappho 1.15ff.. 158 n.24: H. oddly fails to cite Men. *Sam.* 47ff. as an example of modesty in sexual descriptions; cf. also YCS 27 (1982), 310ff.. 202: at Theocritus 7.47  $\delta\rho\mu\chi\epsilon\varsigma$  should be translated 'cocks' not 'birds', in view of the presence of  $\kappa\omicron\kappa\kappa\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  in the following verse. 224: 'summer equinox' is a slip for 'summer solstice'. 230: at Aratus 1028 H. translates  $\xi\omicron\nu\theta\alpha\iota$  as 'yellow' when applied to bees, but see rather Gow on Theocritus 7.142. 246 n.55: in his discussion of approved verisimilitude in ancient art H. curiously fails to refer to Theocritus 15.80ff.. 252 n.62: H. misrepresents what I say in *G&R* 18 (1971), 126f.; in discussing Herodas 5, I do not say that Kydilla is in love with Gastron, but only that Herodas here leaves the situation obscure and ambiguous. 314 line 7: read 'Attis' for 'Catullus'.

Copyright © 1988 W.Geoffrey Arnott

Review: Philip Harding (UBC Vancouver)

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov./Dec. 1988) 155-156

K.Adshead, *Politics of the Archaic Peloponnese: The transition from Archaic to Classical politics*, Avebury 1986, pp.142, price not stated. ISBN 0-86127-024-X

Kallimakhos did not go far enough. Even small books can hurt. The one reviewed here is proof.

Not to say that the thesis is all that bad, though parts are strained and extracted from unwilling and, at times, unco-operative evidence. It runs essentially as follows: the possibility for political unification of the northeast Peloponnese was not precluded by geography. A network of roads provided for north-south communications between Corinth, Argos and the Arkadian cities. Unified, the area could have become 'hegemon of central Greece'; in fact it ended up 'the fragmented landbridge between superpowers' (p.1). Adshead's answer (ch.2) is that geography is not everything. The key element in Archaic politics was Archaic religion and in this respect the three regions were so different in outlook that unification was not possible. In his own inimitable words, 'Arcadian hierophanies of a non-agricultural world differ greatly from Argolic religion with its valorization of time and the uni-linear historic process (genealogy, legends) and differ again from the agricultural rituals of Corinth with its articulate myths and symbols of death and rebirth' (20-21). Thus the old-fashioned and superstitious nature of Arkadian cult rendered its people vulnerable to such tricks as the bones of Orestes, While Argos' chauvinistic use of myth as propaganda, her demythologising of the past, 'cut [her] off from the cultures of the rest of the Peloponnese' (23). As for Corinth, her religious experience was so intense that she could not use it to bring about political ends.

Typical of the religious nature of Archaic politics were the 'Crown Games' which are treated to a whole chapter (ch.3). But in the 5th century politics became more secularised. For the northeast Peloponnese the transition period was the decades 480-460. Athens was the stimulant, in the person of Themistokles. Her sudden emergence as the leading naval power alarmed the Corinthians (ch.4) into making an uncharacteristic attempt at uniting the district through the old-style politics of religion. She took over the Nemean Games and changed the crown at the Isthmian Games from pine to celery, a more Dorian symbol. But because of her adoption of strange near-eastern cults, Corinth could not be Dorian enough.

Anyway it was too late. A new style of politics was spreading from Athens – or, rather, being spread by Themistokles (ch.5). In two years (471-469) he helped the Argives organise a counter-bloc, by bringing about democracies in Argos, Elis, Mantinea and Tegea. Thus Corinth's ambitions were thwarted, but when Themistokles left the Peloponnese the spirit went out of the new movement and Argos lost control.

The 405 footnotes and the extensive bibliography demonstrate that Adshead has read widely and can employ a variety of sources. Yet the uneasy feeling remains that so much is based upon so little. But, then, perhaps this is in the nature of any study of the Archaic period. What really mars this book is the style of its presentation. I am not referring here to the errors of proofreading, although there are plenty of those. Rather it is the fact that the book is more a patchwork of quotations from other scholars, most of which should be in the footnotes, than a readable text. Even more offensive are the innumerable glosses in other languages on words in the text and all that jargon that litters every page. Sometimes, too often, jargon lapses into gibberish. I conclude by quoting one sentence, which typifies all that I find objectionable in this book, but which, for all I know, may titillate someone else to go out and read it: 'The cultic pine, as distinct from the agonistic victor's pine, continued in the celery period'.

Copyright © Philip Harding

Review: **Christopher Mee** (Liverpool)

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov./Dec. 1988), 156-157

R.N.L. Barber, *The Cyclades in the Bronze Age*, London, Duckworth, 1987. Pp.302, cloth, £28. ISBN 071-56-21602

The prehistoric Aegean suffers from a lack of recently written, rather than reprinted, textbooks, so this synthesis is most welcome. The author is someone whose affection for the Cyclades is apparent throughout. The islands do not simply serve as a peg for archaeological theory, and he is explicit in his rejection of 'attempts by modern archaeologists to fabricate for themselves an independent discipline from a hotch-potch of materials and methods which are much more constructively employed within the individual fields of study to which they more properly belong'. The main target of this statement is Colin Renfrew's *Emergence of Civilisation*, which represents a rather different approach to the archaeology of the Cyclades. Barber exaggerates the divide which separates the 'processual archaeologist' and the 'cultural historian', but at least we know where we stand.

Chapter 1 describes the physical environment and resources – agricultural, mineral and maritime – of the islands. Appreciation of their diverse character is abetted by an excellent selection of illustrations, judiciously placed in the text. Chapter 2 discusses chronology, and in particular the pottery styles on which this is based. Given the complexity of the Cycladic sequence it is fortunate that the author is a specialist, but a number of issues remain unresolved. I am still not entirely convinced by a subdivision of the Early Cycladic period which has the effect of equating Lefkandi I and Lerna IV, and I would hope that future excavation will enable LCIII to be tied into the Mycenaean sequence more securely.

Chapter 3 outlines the history of archaeological research in the Cyclades, and this is followed by a chapter which considers topics such as site location, construction techniques, settlement layout and fortifications. I feel that some repetition and confusion might have been avoided had this chapter been set out chronologically. In particular I am still not sure of the date of the fortifications at Phylakopi.

The rest of the chapters do follow a chronological order. It seems a pity that we start in the Early Cycladic period rather than the Neolithic. Admittedly the evidence for the earliest settlement on the islands is slight, but recent doubts cast on the date proposed by Renfrew for the domestication of the olive in turn undermine his explanation of the colonisation of the islands. This is an issue which needs to be considered.

The account of the Early Cycladic period is clear and informative. In the section on



metallurgy there is a useful resumé of the evidence for copper mines on Siphnos, and this is pertinent to the discussion of the exploitation of the obsidian sources on Melos which follows. Robin Torrence has argued that the inhabitants of Melos did not control, and therefore profit from, the obsidian quarries, but Barber is convinced that the evident prosperity of Phylakopi must have derived, at least to some extent, from a trade in obsidian.

The Early Cycladic period is so rich archaeologically that the problem, in a synthesis such as this, is one of selection. The Middle Cycladic period seems impoverished by comparison. The critical events of ECIII must be a contributory factor, but I would suspect that the change in funerary practices is also significant in that MC cemeteries have proved singularly elusive, not only for the archaeologist but also for the grave robber. A detailed discussion of the pottery inevitably forms the basis of the Middle Cycladic chapter. It should be noted that in his analysis of interconnections between the Cyclades, Crete and Greece, Barber suggests that early MC = MMIB-II and mature MH/MHII. This seems much more likely than the rather low chronology proposed for the EC/MC transition on the chart, figure 22.

The Middle Cycladic may be a neglected period but this is certainly not true of LCI-II. The explanation is in the titles of Chapters 7 and 8, 'The Cretan Connection' and 'Akrotiri'. Barber wonders whether the Minoans might have been responsible for the destruction of Phylakopi and Ayia Irini at the end of the Middle Cycladic period, and traces the influence of Crete on LCI-II architecture, pottery, frescoes and religion, *inter alia*. Thera is seen to be the most Minoanised of the Cyclades, and it differs from the other islands in that the settlement pattern comprises a major nucleated site and farmsteads. This is reminiscent of Crete, and also recalls Karpathos in the Dodecanese, which was evidently colonised by the Minoans. Were there Minoan colonies in the Cyclades? Barber considers the question, but does not come to a firm conclusion.

The chapter on Akrotiri concentrates on the architecture of the site, a section which would have benefitted from the inclusion of more plans, and on the eruption of the Thera volcano and its effects. This is a topic currently enjoying a period of quiescence, and Barber is consequently able to be brief, but the discovery of massive tephra deposits on Rhodes, and current arguments over the date of the eruption, should ensure that the controversy will rumble on.

Akrotiri, buried under volcanic ash, was at least spared the fate of Phylakopi and Ayia Irini, which were 'forcibly taken over by conquerors from the mainland' at the end of LCII. Chapter 9 considers the impact of the Mycenaeans on the Cyclades, which is seen by Barber as violent. But it is evident that early LCIII, in mainland terms LHIIIA-B, is archaeologically another of the neglected periods in Cycladic prehistory, and this militates against a proper assessment of the process of Mycenaeanisation. The fortification of Phylakopi in middle LCIII = LHIIIB2 foreshadows the disastrous events at the end of the 13th century on the mainland, but the Cyclades seem to have enjoyed a period of prosperity, at least initially, in late LCIII = LHIIIC. In the end, and not unlike the Lone Ranger, the Cycladic civilisation exits unobtrusively and enigmatically.

The crucial role of the Cyclades in Aegean prehistory should be apparent from the length of this review. Barber is to be congratulated in that he has made so much of the evidence readily accessible. The paperback edition should ensure that this will become a standard textbook for undergraduates and for specialists.

Copyright © 1988 Christopher Mee

Review: **Robin Seager** (Liverpool)

LCM 13.9/10 (Nov./Dec. 1988, 157-159)

K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Der Entstehung der Nobilität*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1987. Pp.303, paper.

ISBN 3515046216

Like too many books by younger German scholars writing under the influence of

Christian Meier this work has a tendency to lapse into pretentious sociological jargon, while H. also displays an irritating stylistic affectation of his own: a positive passion for parenthesis. Like most writers on early Rome he takes up a position on the question of sources that boils down to 'I am going to regard as reliable just enough of what we are told to make it possible to write my book'. Nevertheless the result, though not shatteringly original, is sensible, balanced, and well worth reading.

On the negative side H. wishes to challenge the approach to 4th century socio-political history that derives from the *Adelsparteien* posited by Münzer: small groups functioning on both the patrician and plebeian sides from 367 to c.340, thereafter a sudden broadening on both sides. He points out, reasonably enough, that the degree to which Münzer's methods have been undermined by more recent research on the politics of the late Republic must call into question the validity of conclusions about the earlier period arrived at in the same way. To tinker with the details by assuming a greater fluidity and complexity of groupings, with speculations about changes of side, compromises and the like, is not enough. The 'factional' approach undervalues the ruling class as individuals and as a whole, and minimises unduly the role of the Senate while exaggerating that of the presiding magistrate at elections. The enquiry must therefore, according to H., be much more broadly based.

He examines first the period from 366 to 340, in which many elections display abnormalities. It has been suggested that the principal reason for these was a desire on the part of patricians to prevent plebeian consuls from presiding. H. argues that other more *ad hoc* factors may often have played an important part: for instance, the dramatic developments of 356 arose originally out of the military situation. Such factors would have to be inoperative for the effective exploitation of the *interregnum* as a tactical weapon by patricians; patrician senators would also have to manifest a high degree of unity. In general, issues of foreign policy and military command created temporary constellations that crossed the barrier of class, while individual plebeians might be able to exploit patrician rivalries (indeed, despite his strictures on Münzer's methods, H. largely accepts his alignments for the decade from 366).

By 356 iterations had created a promotion block even among the patricians, which engendered a measure of renewed patrician solidarity against plebeian claims. The consequent squeeze sharpened rivalries among the plebeian elite. Yet the *lex Poetelia* benefited not only the few plebeians who had already 'arrived' but the plebs as a whole, for it was vital to avoid the risk of splitting support that was already unstable, while at the same time tactical considerations dictated concentration on the advancement of a handful of plausible candidates. Of the plebiscites of 342, H. finds the provision that both consuls might be plebeian implausible as it stands, speculating instead that it may rather have provided that one consul must be plebeian. This appears to be Early Roman History Plan B: when even an appropriate selection of sources fails to produce the desired answer, *adlib.* . . . Of the others, that demanding a ten-year interval before iteration is, as H. says, easier to explain in context than that banning *cumulatio*; he makes the sound general point that, though breaches of these requirements would undoubtedly still occur, it would henceforth be needful to produce stronger justification. Again, he points to specific pressures that may have helped to inspire the patricians to make concessions: agitation about land and debt, the mutiny at Capua and the Latin threat. The *leges Publiliae* belong in the same context: H. rightly stresses that the insistence on *patrum auctoritas* for legislation in the *comitia* was an assertion of the claims of the Senate as a whole against the patricians.

The first occasion on which a plebeian consul unquestionably presided at the elections was in 296. But H. is inclined to accept the disputed case in 326 and suggests that there may have been others before 300. Since 340 extraordinary elections had not been used to prevent plebeians from presiding, or to secure all patrician colleges. As factors that might play a part H. singles out the limited accessibility of consuls in the field, or a desire to renew the auspices, e.g. after the Caudine Forks in 321. Iterations were common between 340 and 287: 24

patricians and 13 plebeians, of which 11/7 were premature. Again H. sees the military motive as overwhelmingly paramount, even in the case of some apparent patrician exceptions; he emphasises the ominous military situation in 340 (the threat of the Latin war) and 335 (the Sidicini and Cales). Prorogation followed a similar pattern, while also helping to maintain the 'rules' for the normal tenure of magistracies. H. then seeks to document a corresponding change in the role of the tribunes from instruments of an ambitious plebeian elite to instruments of a joint patrician-plebeian nobility. He claims that the last clear case of pro-plebeian tribunician intervention concerned the admission of plebeians to the major priesthoods in 330. The most noteworthy piece of legislation before the new secession of 287, the *plebiscitum Ovinium*, strengthened the Senate against individual magistrates and consolidated the senatorial nobility. The contribution of the tribunes in 287 is obscure, but H. insists that they must have shown great moderation.

In conclusion H. considers the nobility's conception of itself. He emphasises, quite rightly, that the ethos of the *novi homines* merely accepted and ultimately tried to hijack the ideals of *nobilitas*. He has little or nothing new to say on the well-worn themes of *dignitas*, *fides*, *gratia* and *auctoritas*, and seems ingenuously ready to take at face value the standard protestations about devotion to the *res publica* and the sacrifice of self-interest, while admitting that the tensions between unity and destructive individualism were built into the system, the constraints on individualism always precarious. He rightly highlights the development of elaborate forms of public display by the ruling class: public building, statues, dedication of spoils, the ceremonies of triumph and funeral. Magistrates embodied the power of the state in at least implied opposition to the people, and the plebeian elite had never sought to change or limit this. External conditions fostered internal unity and reinforced the importance of military success as the highest criterion of achievement; patricians could not rely on religious and social grounds to preserve their superiority.

As an analysis of the emergence of a homogenous patrician-plebeian ruling class H.'s account is coherent and largely plausible, which is, in the nature of things, the most that can be said for any work on early Roman history. He has little to offer by way of explanation for the acceptance of this process by the Roman people. But then, the tolerance of the Roman people for its rulers is a mystery on a par with the equally baffling patience of the British.

Copyright © 1988 Robin Seager

### Correspondence

from John Taylor, St Francis Xavier's School, Liverpool L25 6EG

16.11.88.

Dear Sir

The article on 'The Speeches in Thucydides' reprinted in LCM October 1988 from *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* January 1841 was written by one Robert Forsyth (*Wellesley Index of Victorian Periodicals* Vol.I; this is a firm attribution based on Blackwood's own records).

Forsyth (1766-1846), aptly described by *DNB* as a 'miscellaneous writer' was a typical Edinburgh *littérateur* of his day: intended for the ministry, he became a lawyer of mildly radical views, a contributor to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and author of numerous books on moral and political subjects and (most famously) on 'The Beauties of Scotland'.

Although *Blackwood's* was less heavyweight than the *Edinburgh* or *Quarterly Review*, it is by no means unusual to find classical essays of some substance in any of these or similar contemporary periodicals addressing a middle-class readership on a variety of subjects. These journals provided, for example, a most important forum for discussion of the successive volumes of the histories of Greece by Thirlwall and Grote. The anonymous



contributors included men of the highest distinction: Macaulay, Brougham, J.S. Mill, Cornwall Lewis. Forsyth's plea that Thucydides' speeches 'ought to be the study of the statesman' invites the observation that in the Victorian age they often were. And we can but view with nostalgia a period which took for granted the 'microscopic accuracy . . . so often attained' in Greek and Latin by British pupils.

Yours faithfully  
John Taylor

*The Editor received a number of letters identifying the author, and indicating by implication how he might have been able to do so for himself. But had he done so he would not have been able to print the above with its interesting comments on the present state of Classics in the Schools.*

From Professor W. Geoffrey Arnott, The School of Classics, The University of Leeds,  
17 October 1988  
Leeds LS2 9JT

Sir,

With regard to Dr Sutton's article on Ar. Ach. in the July number of LCM (13.7 [Jul. 1988], 105-108) see (1) Ter. Eun. 40f., (2) C. Bailey, 'Who played "Dicaeopolis"?' in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford 1936), 231-240.

I am, Sir, yrs etc.

W. Geoffrey Arnott

From Professor William M. Calder III, The Villa Mowitz, Urbana, Illinois,  
7th December 1988

Sir,

I am often asked whether Wilamowitz was as intelligent as Theodor Mommsen. I have no idea. Or whether Eduard Fraenkel was a greater student of Wilamowitz than Felix Jacoby or Werner Jaeger was. Again I have no idea. Professor Lloyd-Jones queries whether A.E. Housman knew Greek 'better than, say, Edgar Lobel' did (LCM 13.8 [Oct. 1988], 128).

1. Wilamowitz remarked to Miss Annette B. Meakin of A.E. Housman in summer 1926 that the Germans 'unanimously pronounce him to be the greatest living authority on both Latin and Greek in the English-speaking world'. See Grant Richards, *Housman 1897-1936* (New York 1941; reprinted 1973), 84 n..

2. A.E. Housman in a letter of 22 October 1927 to J.G. Frazer remarked of Wilamowitz: '... in verbal scholarship and textual criticism, he is a very great man, the greatest now living and comparable with the greatest of the dead'. See Robert Ackerman, *GRBS* 15 (1974), 362.

3. Edgar Lobel remarked to the late Sir Eric Turner: 'Euripides, like Wilamowitz, knew no Greek'. See Sir Eric Turner, *Excavating in Egypt: The Egypt Exploration Society 1882-1982*, ed. T.G.H. James (Chicago/London 1982), 174.

The only explanation for Lobel's opinion is that he could not grasp Wilamowitz' contribution, whereas Housman could. Housman, therefore, as Professor Jocelyn and Wilamowitz hold, knew Greek better than Lobel.

I am, Sir, yours,

William M. Calder III

William Abbott Oldfather Professor of the Classics.